# THE
# SOCIAL AND MILITARY POSITION
# OF THE
# RULING CASTE IN ANCIENT INDIA,

# THE

# SOCIAL AND MILITARY POSITION

# OF THE

# RULING CASTE IN ANCIENT INDIA,

## AS REPRESENTED BY THE SANSKRIT EPIC;

## With an Appendix on the Status of Woman.

By EDWARD W. HOPKINS.

BHARAT-BHARATI
Oriental Publishers & Booksellers
B 28/15, DURGA KUND, VARANASI-5
1972

*Published by*
BHARAT-BHARATI
Oriental Publishers & Booksellers
B 28/15, DURGA KUND, VARANASI-5

303.522
H 774 P
303.522
HOP

FIRST PUBLISHED 1889
SECOND REPRINT 1972

Published by Suresh Pandey, Bharat-Bharati, Oriental Publishers & Booksellers,
B28/15, Durga Kund, Varanasi-5 (India) & Printed by K.L. Sachdeva,
Skylark Printers (Offset) 11355, Id-Gah Road, N. Delhi-55 (India)

# CONTENTS

---

I. Origin of the Epic, p. 2.
II. Historical value of the Epic, p. 14.
III. A. The Social position of the Ruling Caste: the Caste in general; divisions of the People, p. 16.

B. Royalty.

1. The King, p. 57.
2. Royal Duties, p. 59.
3. Royal Occupations, p. 69.
4. Modes of Government, p. 79.
5. Succession; choice of King; primogeniture, p. 81.
6. Royal Consecration, p. 89.
7. Assembly and Council, p. 92.
8. Purohita and Priestly Power, p. 95.
9. Ambassador, p. 106.
10. Social Relations of the King, p. 108.
11. Royal Marriage, p. 111.
12. Royal Burial, p. 114.
13. The Imperial City, p. 118.
14. Note on Caste-exchange, p. 123.

IV. Military Position of the Ruling Caste.

1. Philosophy of War, p. 125.
2. General Fighting-force and Military Sentiment, p. 128.
3. Military Tactics, p. 135.
4. Observations on the Usages in the Field, p. 163.
5. Laws of Battle, p. 171.
6. Army-forces in Detail, p. 177.
A. The Chariot, p. 179.
The Charioteer, p. 195.
The Chariot-steeds, p. 199.
The Chariot-knight, p. 203.
B. Cavalry, p. 206.
C. Elephant-riders, p. 209
D. Weapons, p. 213
E. Armor and Defense, p. 303.
Remarks on Magic and Science of Weapons, p. 252.
F. Paraphernalia of Battle and Music in the Epic, p. 260. 262.
V. Appendix on the Status of Woman, p. 274.
The Girl, p. 283.
The Wife, p. 296.
The Widow, p. 314.

# THE SOCIAL AND MILITARY POSITION
# OF THE
# RULING CASTE IN ANCIENT INDIA,
## AS REPRESENTED BY THE SANSKRIT EPIC.

By EDWARD W. HOPKINS.

## Preface.

This essay, in its original form, was read before the Oriental Society in May, 1886. Further contributions to the subject, made as reported in the subsequent Proceedings of the Society, have now been incorporated into the work, and the point of view of the whole somewhat extended.

My first intention was to record the data furnished by the Mahābhārata in regard to the Warrior-caste. I have since been led to add matter illustrative of my topic from works more or less parallel to the Epic, and this paper now offers *δι' ἐκτύπων* an inquiry into the conditions of civilization in the Middle Ages of India from the point of view of the ruling-power. Into wider questions of pan-Aryan interest I have through lack of space refrained from entering: for example, into that of land-ownership and village communities, where a new and thorough investigation of India's position is needed.

I believe no especially Epic study of Hindu civilization has yet been attempted. My authorities are, therefore, chiefly the native texts.*

---

* A study of the Vedic period is presented by Zimmer's *Altindisches Leben*. Weber's Collectanea (*Indische Studien*, vol. x.), Lassen's *Indische Alterthumskunde*, and Müller's India touch on some of the points here discussed. On Wilson's Art of War and Rājendralāla-Mitra's Indo-Aryans I shall speak more particularly below. On Epic antiquities Muir has some scattered remarks and a few special studies in his Sanskrit Texts. To these general acknowledgment is due. The term Epic I limit, for convenience, to the Mahābhārata, although,

The following abbreviations require explanation. Unprefixed numerical references imply that the quotation is from the Mahābhārata, Bombay edition.*

R. = Rāmāyaṇa, ed. Gorresio; M. = Manu's law-book (*mānavadharmaçāstra*); G. = Gāutama's law-book (*dharmaçāstra*), ed. Stenzler; Vās. = Vasiṣṭha's law-book (id.), ed. Führer; Āp. = Āpastamba's law-book (*dharmasūtra*), ed. Bühler; B. = translation of Bāudhāyana by Bühler. V. P. and Ag. P. denote respectively the Vishnu and Agni Purāṇas. The names of other Purāṇas and the authors of the House-laws (*gṛhyasūtra*) are when quoted given in full.

## I. Introduction. Origin of the Epic.

In order to a better understanding of the material from which are drawn the chief quotations preferred in this essay, a word will be necessary in regard to the present and past condition of the Hindu Epic. The poem is of obscure origin. History fails us, and who can trust Hindu tradition? More than this: the work when analyzed appears to be inwardly inconsistent. In the same heroes we discover different characters. Opposite tendencies seem at work. The highest god is at the same time a tricky mortal. The chief knights are depicted now as good and now as sinful men. The original theme is, as it were, diverted from its course.†

---

conversely, this Epic is regarded by native authorities as an 'art-poem,' as was long ago pointed out by Müller (*tyayā ca kāvyam ity uktaṁ tasmāt kāvyam bhaviṣyati*, Mbh. i. 1. 72; Müller, Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 41). The part of this Epic embraced by the twelfth and thirteenth books I call pseudo-Epic. In regard to the origin of the Mahābhārata I have briefly discussed Holtzmann's general argument (*Epos*) in my Introduction, but ignored his speculations on Epic Buddhism: in respect of which I can say only that they fail to convince me of his *demonstrandum*. On the important subject of the critique of our received text of the poem I have not touched in this essay. [See now a paper thereon by the writer reported in the Proceedings for October, 1888.]

* A Pathfinder or concordance of references for the Bombay and Calcutta editions equated by verse-decades has been prepared by the writer, and will soon be published.

† An abstract will indicate this. Of two possible heirs to the throne of Hāstinapura, Pāndu, the younger, having succeeded to the sovereignty on account of the blindness of his elder brother, Dhritarāshtra, finally grew weary of ruling, and, retiring into the woods, where he died, left his kingdom to the blind Dhritarāshtra. The latter, regarding Yudhishthira, Pāndu's eldest son, as rightful heir, caused him at first to be proclaimed crown prince; but subsequently, persuaded by Duryodhana and others of his sons, reconsidered the matter, yielded to sin, permitted Yudhishthira with his four brothers (called the Pāndus, as opposed to the Kurus, Duryodhana and his brothers) to be enticed out of the city, and then settled the whole kingdom on his own son. But the Pāndus, at first expelled and in mortal danger, after proceeding to Panchāla and forming an alliance with that king by a polyandrous marriage with his daughter, returned to Hāstinapura, backed by Pan-

From outside sources we know only that the poem is mentioned in the Sūtra of Āçvalāyana, and seems to be intended in a description of a Hindu epic given by Dio Chrysostomos, in a fragment that may have come from Megasthenes. In the event of the description being original with the first, 100 A. D. may be set as the date of this information; with the second, 400 B. C.* What other accounts we have are not less doubtful in date. Thus, the poem is known to the Mahābhāṣya; but the earliest date of this work is 140 B. C.,† while Pāṇini's evidence is negative, mentioning characters but not the poem by name. Of the war, only the Epic gives an account, and the date of the conflict is matter of inference. Thus, Schroeder reckons that it antedates the Yajur-Veda, because the Kuru-Panchāla alliance therein recorded must have been the result of the war; but this is absolutely uncertain. Analysis led Lassen to suppose that the original poem was an account of a war between Kurus and Panchālas, not between Kurus and Pāndus. There is no very weighty reason for the view thus expressed. The poem itself asserts that its theme is the Kuru-Pāndu war. Objections offered to believing this are based on the fact that the Kurus are an old family, known in more ancient literature, while the Pāndus are not. The working-over of the poem is also thought to be attested by the fact that its introductory part states it to have had different beginnings and different lengths—8800 couplets, 24,000, and 100,000; but as, aside from other proofs of recent time, it is evident that the last length could not have been noted till the work had been completed, this whole

---

chāla's influence, made terms with their relatives, and took half the realm. In a corner of this they founded and occupied a new town, Indraprastha; and here, after years of conquests, they held a celebration that awakened the envy of Duryodhana, who soon challenged Yudhishthira to a deceitful game of dice. In its course the latter played away his newly acquired greatness, and then gambled again with the understanding that the loser should this time become a hermit. He lost, went into the woods with his brothers, and remained there in accordance with his promise for twelve years. At the close of one further year he found an ally, invoked anew the aid of Panchāla, elected Krishna (Vishnu) as his aid, marched against Hāstinapura with a large force, and routed the yet larger army of Duryodhana by means of desperate and unscrupulous fighting on the part of the Pāndu knights and the unfairly used influence of Krishna (whose help the Kurus had scorned). He found no one to oppose him within the town, and had himself crowned king of both Hāstinapura and Indraprastha; and finally, after a long reign, laid down the crown in order to climb up to heaven in company with his four brothers and the family wife: the successful accomplishment of this journey terminating the story.

* The different views on this subject have lately been set forth by L. von Schroeder, in his *Indiens Literatur und Cultur*, p. 464. Weber thinks the mention in Āçvalāyana an interpolation. Compare Lassen, *Ind. Alt.*, i. 589-592.

† Weber, *Lit.*, p. 201, 241.

statement can only be regarded as one of comparatively late origin, belonging to the final development of the Epic—a time when the writers knew little in regard to the working-over of their inherited verses. At present the text is overburdened with extraneous matter, tales, laws, moral codes, theologies, metaphysics, quite stifling the original body of living poetry.

From another point of view, efforts have been made to prove not only a change, but a complete inversion (in our present story) of the original theme. This criticism bases itself on the want of unity in the characters. Starting with the two-fold nature of Krishna-Vishnu as man and god,* and with the glossed-over sins of the Pāndus, the critic argues that the first poem was written for the glory of the Kurus, and subsequently tampered with to magnify the Pāndus; and that in this latter form we have our present Epic, dating from before the fourth century B. C.; since the worship of Vishnu was in Megasthenes' time triumphant over that of Brahmā, and it is with the cult of the former god that the Pāndus are bound up. The first poem would thus be completely changed, or, as Schroeder in describing the theory says,† 'set upon its head.' Schroeder's exposition of the theory, being the latest outcome of this criticism (we are indebted to Adolph Holtzmann for its tone), will serve as at once the clearest and most recent explanation of how the Epic may thus have been inverted. 'The original poet (he says in substance) lived at a time when Brahmā was the highest god (700 to 500 or 400 B. C.); and this singer was a child of the Kuru-land. He heard reports of the celebrated Kuru race that once reigned in his land, but had been destroyed by the dishonorable fighting of a strange race of invaders. This tragical overthrow he depicted in such a way as to make his native heroes models of knightly virtue, while he painted the victors (Pāndus, Panchālas, Matsyas), with Krishna, hero of the Yādavas, at their head, as ignoble and shamefully victorious. This is the old Bhārata song mentioned in Āçvalāyana. After a time Krishna became a god, and his priests, supported by the Pāndus, sought to make Krishna (Vishnu) worthy to be set against Buddha. Their exertions were successful. Vishnu in the fourth century became the great god, and his grateful priests rewarded their helpers, the Pāndus, by taking the Bhārata poem in hand and making a complete change in the story, so as to relieve them of the reproaches of the old poet. Finally they worked it into such shape that it praised the Pāndus and blamed their opponents. About this time they inserted all the episodes that glorify Vishnu as the highest god. The Pāndus then pretended that they had originally belonged to the Kuru stock, and the cousinship portrayed in the poem was invented; whereas they were really an alien, probably a southern, race.'*

---

* On Krishna as shepherd, see Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 770.

† *Lit. u. Cult.*, p. 479.

How differently the same set of facts may be converted into theories is seen by comparing the view of Ludwig.† This scholar holds that the original story was an account of a war between the Bharatas and Kurus, while the Pāndus are a sun and earth myth. Krishnā, the dark (earth), is an attractive solution of the polyandrous marriage. The Pāndus are the seasons, each in turn possessing the earth. But the same name in Krishna as the sun is somewhat objectionable. Ludwig's paper is ingenious, but to me unconvincing.

The only basis that we have for inverting the theme of the present poem is in what Schroeder, who warmly supports the inversion-theory, calls ‡ 'the justification of the hateful rôle evidently played by the Pāndus in the old form of the Epic, and the reproaches heaped upon the Kurus, the royal heroes of the old poem.' Theories once started increase, as it were of their own accord, in force of statement. With each new advocate a surer color is given, whence the hypothesis gathers new strength, while the facts remain as at first. The quotation above given contains the last embodiment of a theory (now nearly forty years old) necessitating an entire inversion of the Epic story. What reason have we for believing in this 'justification of the hateful rôle evidently played by the Pāndus?' Do the Pāndus (relatively) play such a rôle? Does the 'justification' of the acts of the Pāndus require us to believe that they were first depicted as the ancestral foes of the original writer or writers? On the assumption that these points cannot be denied hangs the whole inversion-theory. From the religious point of view we have no unanimity of criticism; Schroeder considers Krishna as unitary, deified by the Pāndus, insulted by the Kurus; Holtzmann, with less probability, assumes two distinct Krishnas. The change in the human characters is the mainstay of the modern interpretation.

To my mind, the assumptions on which this theory is based are more negatively wrong than positively untrue. It is true that reproaches are heaped upon the Kurus. But reproaches are also heaped upon the Pāndus. It is true that the Pāndus appear to have played a hateful rôle; but so do the Kurus. It statement can only be regarded as one of comparatively late origin, belonging to the final development of the Epic—a time when the writers knew little in regard to the working-over of their inherited verses. At present the text is overburdened with extraneous matter, tales, laws, moral codes, theologies, metaphysics, quite stifling the original body of living poetry.

---

* Scarcely reconcilable with the theory that the nucleus of the Epic is the war between the Kurus and Panchālas (see Schroeder, loc. cit., 457 and 479).

† To which Schroeder does not allude. It is found in the *Abhandl. d. Königl. böhm. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, vi. Folge, 12 Band.

‡ *Lit. u. Cult.*, p. 479. Holtzmann (Sr.), *Sagen*; (Jr.), *Epos*.

From another point of view, efforts have been made to prove not only a change, but a complete inversion (in our present story) of the original theme. This criticism bases itself on the want of unity in the characters. Starting with the two-fold nature of Krishna-Vishnu as man and god,* and with the glossed-over sins of the Pāndus, the critic argues that the first poem was written for the glory of the Kurus, and subsequently tampered with to magnify the Pāndus; and that in this latter form we have our present Epic, dating from before the fourth century B. C.; since the worship of Vishnu was in Megasthenes' time triumphant over that of Brahmā, and it is with the cult of the former god that the Pāndus are bound up. The first poem would thus be completely changed, or, as Schroeder in describing the theory says,† 'set upon its head.' Schroeder's exposition of the theory, being the latest outcome of this criticism (we are indebted to Adolph Holtzmann for its tone), will serve as at once the clearest and most recent explanation of how the Epic may thus have been inverted. 'The original poet (he says in substance) lived at a time when Brahmā was the highest god (700 to 500 or 400 B. C.); and this singer was a child of the Kuru-land. He heard reports of the celebrated Kuru race that once reigned in his land, but had been destroyed by the dishonorable fighting of a strange race of invaders. This tragical overthrow he depicted in such a way as to make his native heroes models of knightly virtue, while he painted the victors (Pāndus, Panchālas, Matsyas), with Krishna, hero of the Yādavas, at their head, as ignoble and shamefully victorious. This is the old Bhārata song mentioned in Āçvalāyana. After a time Krishna became a god, and his priests, supported by the Pāndus, sought to make Krishna (Vishnu) worthy to be set against Buddha. Their exertions were successful. Vishnu in the fourth century became the great god, and his grateful priests rewarded their helpers, the Pāndus, by taking the Bhārata poem in hand and making a complete change in the story, so as to relieve them of the reproaches of the old poet. Finally they worked it into such shape that it praised the Pāndus and blamed their opponents. About this time they inserted all the episodes that glorify Vishnu as the highest god. The Pāndus then pretended that they had originally belonged to the Kuru stock, and the cousinship portrayed in the poem was invented; whereas they were really an alien, probably a southern, race.'*

---

* On Krishna as shepherd, see Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 770.

† *Lit. u. Cult.*, p. 479.

How differently the same set of facts may be converted into theories is seen by comparing the view of Ludwig.† This scholar holds that the original story was an account of a war between the Bharatas and Kurus, while the Pāndus are a sun and earth myth. Krishnā, the dark (earth), is an attractive solution of the polyandrous marriage. The Pāndus are the seasons, each in turn possessing the earth. But the same name in Krishna as the sun is somewhat objectionable. Ludwig's paper is ingenious, but to me unconvincing.

The only basis that we have for inverting the theme of the present poem is in what Schroeder, who warmly supports the inversion-theory, calls ‡ 'the justification of the hateful rôle evidently played by the Pāndus in the old form of the Epic, and the reproaches heaped upon the Kurus, the royal heroes of the old poem.' Theories once started increase, as it were of their own accord, in force of statement. With each new advocate a surer color is given, whence the hypothesis gathers new strength, while the facts remain as at first. The quotation above given contains the last embodiment of a theory (now nearly forty years old) necessitating an entire inversion of the Epic story. What reason have we for believing in this 'justification of the hateful rôle evidently played by the Pāndus?' Do the Pāndus (relatively) play such a rôle? Does the 'justification' of the acts of the Pāndus require us to believe that they were first depicted as the ancestral foes of the original writer or writers? On the assumption that these points cannot be denied hangs the whole inversion-theory. From the religious point of view we have no unanimity of criticism; Schroeder considers Krishna as unitary, deified by the Pāndus, insulted by the Kurus; Holtzmann, with less probability, assumes two distinct Krishnas. The change in the human characters is the mainstay of the modern interpretation.

To my mind, the assumptions on which this theory is based are more negatively wrong than positively untrue. It is true that reproaches are heaped upon the Kurus. But reproaches are also heaped upon the Pāndus. It is true that the Pāndus appear to have played a hateful rôle; but so do the Kurus. It is true that the Pāndus are justified; but is there no other reason for this than that assumed by the theory?.

---

* Scarcely reconcilable with the theory that the nucleus of the Epic is the war between the Kurus and Panchālas (see Schroeder, loc. cit., 457 and 479).

† To which Schroeder does not allude. It is found in the *Abhandl. d. Königl. böhm. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, vi. Folge, 12 Band.

‡ *Lit. u. Cult.*, p. 479. Holtzmann (Sr.), *Sagen*; (Jr.), *Epos*.

Unless we are willing to reject upon a theory and then theorize upon the rejection, we must admit that the same book and age that contain the reproaches heaped upon the Kurus contain similar reproaches against the Pāndus. Now, passing for a moment the question of the relative sinfulness in the rôles of each party as given by the earliest poem, let us ask why it should naturally follow that the Pāndus alone were justified by the poet? We find many cases where the Pāndus do wrong, are reproached, and are then excused. The inversion-theory says that they sinned in the old poem, and that the poem was rewritten to make them appear good. Suppose we imagine the possibility of the poem being simply what it pretends to be—an account of the Pāndus' conquest of the Kurus. Imagine this poem added to from time to time, as we know it must have been, by the hands of priests bound to glorify, for religious or other reasons, the conquerors in the war. Is it not likely that they would have excused wrongs committed by their own party, which a more naive moral sense had long before depicted without shame? Is it likely, on the other hand, that in excusing their own side they would have taken the trouble to excuse the other, or to exalt their opponents' virtue? It seems to me that up to this point (given an old poem containing records of barbarous deeds done by both parties) it is not necessary to assume an inversion of theme merely because the conquering side is exalted and excused by the conqueror's bards. The inversion-theory, however, assumes that such one-sided extolment obliges us to believe in an original poet who painted the victors black, and in a new poet who re-painted them white. It is perhaps scarcely well to criticize Schroeder's poetical fancy of the sorrowing child of the Kuru-land; but it is a fair question to ask, considering the conditions under which Epic poetry was produced in India, what object a poet would have in writing a poem for public recitation or private circulation with the intent of vilifying those that now ruled his land?

But we have, admitting for the moment that our Pāndus as victors might naturally be glorified by Pāndu priests, a further question to ask: why in process of glorifying the Pāndus was it necessary for later bards to justify their works as represented in the earlier poem?

To answer this question (if we may assert for the time being that the inversion-theory is not yet established), let us consider what were the great developing factors of our Epic. What induced the insertion of this huge bulk of plainly late matter? In part, these additions consist of religious novelties; in part, they are of moral-didactic origin. Has not this last influence been under-estimated in treating of the 'working-over' of the poem? Let us reflect upon the fact, evident to anyone that has traced the lines of growth in Hindu civilization, that, as religion descended, morality ascended; that the later religious feeling was less simple and less pure than the earlier, but the later morality was higher and stricter than that of a former age; or that, at least, the didactic morality as last inculcated was superior to that recognized at first. Consider how penetrated is the Epic by this later morality; how ethical need imposes long sermons on us (not religious) at every turn; how it has added chapter after chapter at variance with earlier feeling and custom; how it everywhere teaches abhorrence of wrong acts, from a point of view often of sternest right; how it condemns the barbarities of an early uncivilized community; how it imposes its new law on the daily acts of life; how it has composed a formal 'code of fighting' that inculcates law more humane than was possibly consistent with the practices of the older times commemorated by the first form of the poem —and then let us ask this question: is it not reasonable to suppose that those same priests who framed the fighting code and endeavored to implant in their brutal warrior-kings a moral, not to say a chivalrous sentiment, might have been swayed by two opposing desires in handing down their national Epic? We know what happened to the text of Homer when his morality offended that of certain Alexandrians. Is it too much to suppose that the Hindu moral teachers (for they were truly that, while being as a body unscrupulous of rewards) felt this same necessity of expunging or excusing the sins of those heroes who had gradually become national models of royal and knightly honor? I conceive it possible that these priests, after spending much labor to expound what a king ought to be, should have made every effort to cause those heroes who had now become from success and glory of war popular types of perfect knights to appear in a light consonant with the moral principles that priestly ethics would inculcate. But how was this possible? The poem was there; it was the popular story; it teemed with records of acts harmonious with the older morality, inconsistent with that of the developed moral sense. So—might they not?—they modified what they could not erase; they excused what they could not pardon; they called in as a last resort the direct command of their deity to justify what to mortal apprehension was unjustifiable; for, if Vishnu commanded a hero to do this, who could question the right or the wrong? The early tale artlessly relates how, Arjuna, the defender of the faith, shoots Karna when the latter is helpless. Did the old morality revolt at this? I think not. But the new morality comes, that says 'no noble (Aryan) knight will fight except on equal terms.'

What then are the priests to do? They turn to God. It was Vishnu who shouted to Arjuna 'strike him now,' and the great hero, questioning not the word of God, though with great reluctance, shoots his helpless foe. Here, says the priest, is the truth of this story. Certainly Arjuna killed Karna thus; but you may not cite it for a precedent against our 'code of war,' since God inspired the act from occult reasons, and that takes the deed out of our sphere of judgment.

Another method of eliminating the evil consequences of a bad moral precedent is shown in the priest's choosing the less of two evils. His two inclinations were to glorify the Pāndus, and to uphold a sound morality. In some cases he sacrifices the first to the second. Thus, he permits the justified reproaches of the Kurus to remain against his own heroes. The reproaches are based on a common-sense fairness, but always from the subjective point of view of the person interested and badly treated. Thus, the Kurus reproach the Pāndu bitterly for interfering between two men who are fighting, and for killing his friend's foe who is getting the better of his friend. Arjuna laughs at this *ex parte* view of the case: 'Why,' says he, 'what nonsense for you to blame me! I saw my friend worsted, and struck the man who was worsting him. How are we to have a conflict if every man is to go off and fight by himself? That is no way to fight.' Now, as it seems to me, the Kurus' position expresses an opinion not necessarily founded on any abstraction of right and wrong, though it may indicate an advance on Pāndu morality. But the perplexed priest, unable to omit this striking and vivid scene, finds that the reproaches of the Kurus coincide with his own abstract principles, and he lets them stand, strengthening them with a quotation from his own code, for the sake of moral fighting, even if it offends against his hero. For Arjuna has, from the later point of view, absolutely no valid excuse.

We must remember, again, that if there is any truth at all in the legend of this war and the history of the combatants, then the long-established and noble house of Kurus represented in a modified form a higher degree of civilization than these *nouveaux riches*, these vulgar and modern Pāndus, who not till much later became an established house and men of mark in the civilized community into which they had intruded. Thus it may well have been that the Kurus had really a more developed conscience in the ceremony of right than had the Pāndus, albeit that of both stood far below the plane represented by the priestly poets of subsequent days. The social development of the Kurus was higher, as they had a longer civilization to fall back upon; and we shall perhaps be able to admit that the Kurus' wrath in the above scene was not wholly *ex parte*, but embodied one of their earlier rules than led afterward to the full code of the completed ethic. Yet we cannot assert for them or their acts any great moral superiority over the Pāndus. Their peculiar sins, however, do seem to smack of a more cultivated wickedness. The Pāndus sin in a very ungentlemanly way. The Kurus sin likewise, but after the manner of adroit and polite rascals. They do not break their smaller laws of propriety. They do not play tricks openly and then exult in them. But they secretly seek to burn the Pāndus alive; they skillfully deceive the Pāndu king at dice and pretend it was fair play; they form a conspiracy and send ten men at once to kill Arjuna; they slay Arjuna's son in order first to weaken the father's heart (later imitated by the Pāndus); they are, in a word, cunning and sly, while the Pāndus are brutal and fierce. But in most cases the crimes of each must have appeared in their nakedness equally shocking to the codified morality of a later era.

So it seems to me that the ethical sense of a subsequent age might have worked upon the legends it received. Not the inversion of the story and of the characters was, perhaps, the aim of the later poets. They only, as I think, blurred the picture where it was too suggestive of evil in should-be types of holiness. But if we accept the inversion-theory, we shall believe that the Pāndus and their partisans, the priests of Vishnu, took a poem that was written to defame the Pāndus and Vishnu, and wrote it over again so as to represent these as perfect. Such is the opinion of scholars justly eminent in criticism of the Epic and in Sanskrit scholarship. As to what basis this theory rests upon enough has been said. We owe all our constructive criticism as well as destructive in this line to Holtzmann; and it is necessary to say that, in suggesting other possibilities than those advocated by him, one only re-builds the material that he has furnished. But supposing it were possible that our present Epic is the legitimate continuation of an original theme, and not a total inversion of it, let us look at the conditions under which it might have arisen. It would not be necessary to reject the supposition of a Pāndu-Panchāla alliance against the Kurus; but there would be no reason for supposing the war essentially Panchāla's, with the Pāndus added as adventitious adherents of that older royal family. The attempt to reconcile king Dhritarāshtra of the Yajur-Veda literature with the date of the late upstart Kurus may be abandoned, as common sense demands: and more than common sense. To that Brahmanic period king Dhritarāshtra is real; the Pāndus as a people are unknown. But to the Epic period the Pāndus are real, and the hypothecated king of the Kurus is a mere shadow. The real king of the Kurus (he receives the title of *rājā* in the poem as it stands to-day) is Duryodhana. It is only in the secondary fable that

Dhritarāshtra is prominent. In the real action of the piece the latter is as good as silent, but becomes, first and last, conspicuous as a lay-figure on which to exhibit teachings of various sorts. To the writers of the Epic the Pāndus seem to have been genuine founders of a dynasty. What had they accomplished? They, a new race, not known by ancestors noble enough to be reflected in the older literature, became formidable through allying themselves with the Panchālas. They attacked and overthrew the venerable Kuru empire, and seated themselves upon the throne of these vanquished Kurus. And which Kurus? Those of the Vedic age? Is it likely that such an event could have taken place unnoticed in the light of the Dhritarāshtra of the Yajus? We must remember that Janamejaya is also of Brahmanic antiquity, but that the Pāndus are unknown. The solution of the difficulty seems to me to lie in a very likely assumption. It is this: that the Pāndus fought and conquered the Kurus, not the old Kurus in their height of renown, but the weak descendants of that race, who came long after the Dhritarāshtra of the Brahmanic period. And now what may we imagine to have followed? The priests of the Pāndus—who, as I think, wrote the poem originally on essentially the same lines as portrayed today, barring the inferior moral tone of the first version—in order to exalt the glory of the new house, made out the combat of their national heroes to have been not with the weaker man who really fell, but with the race in its early pride, supported and headed by the glory of the Dhritarāshtra of old, whose name perhaps, without his power, was really borne by this, his inferior descendant. It is not at all necessary to insist poetically on the double name. Hindu historical feeling is quite capable of simply introducing the ancient king into the new era—or, we may perhaps better say, of running the modern contest with all its appurtenances back into a remoter Vedic age. In this same spirit they also pretended that the ancient Janamejaya was the son of the modern hero: that is to say, they put back the hero into an antiquity obscure enough to father him upon Janamejaya. The older, the more venerable; the more venerable, the more glorious the contest. So, too, the eldest of the Pāndus, Yudhishthira, once called Dharma, draws about him the mantle of wisdom associated with that name from the early period; and while in the first stratum of the poem he is nothing but a headstrong, wilful, and cruel head of a family-clan, in the pseudo-Epic he is the incarnation of law and morality.

As to the three periods of development in the poem, although I see no reason for believing any arithmetical statement made by a Hindu in regard to the verses contained in an unguarded poem, we may accept the conclusion that there has been in general a gradual enlargement, since we can plainly trace the rough outlines of growth.*

We may even go farther, and admit a general threefold evolution (not inversion), judging by the appearance of the poem as it stands to-day. For, examining the work, we find that upon the original story, the Bhārata, have been grafted many 'secondary tales' (*upākhyāna*); and upon these, and apart from these, have been inserted whole poems of romantic, ethical, and theological character, having nothing to do with the course of the Epic itself. We must, however, remember that our Epic has been enlarged in two ways: first, by a natural expansion of matter already extant; secondly, by unnatural addition of new material. The twelfth book may serve as a type of the latter; the eighth, of the former. These dynamically added parts (the twelfth book etc.) bear about the same relation to the original that cars do to a locomotive. We may say, if we will, that the original has 'grown,' but in reality it only drags a load.†

Although not anxious at present to set up a scheme of distention and addition as the plan of growth of the Epic, I may indicate here what seems to me to have been the probable course of events.

If we begin by discarding what appears of most recent origin, we shall certainly strike out first what I have called the pseudo-Epic, and with it the books that follow; for, though pretending to carry on the tale, the fourteenth book, depending on the thirteenth, and existing for the sake of the Anugītā, must fall into the same category with its immediate predecessors; and the fifteenth, with its system of *nīti* leading into the later tales of the heroes after the war is over, takes us to that stage where the Harivaṁça is but a natural sequence of the un-Epic nonsense preceding. The last two books we further see omitted in one of the Epic's own catalogues; and, upon the grounds of the complete catalogue in the first book, and the opening chapters bearing on their face every mark of posteriority to the account of the main story, we shall be inclined to put the greater part of the first book into the same list as that of the last. This would leave us at the second stage; and beyond this we cannot reject by books, but by sections; for Vishnuism stands side by side with Çivaism and the older Brahmaism, and the chapters of didactic dreariness are interwoven with the thread of the story. These preaching chapters, with the theological chapters, seem to me to belong to the same period of addition as the mass of unnecessary stories here and there interpolated, although some of the latter bear the stamp of being older each as a whole than the time when they were inserted into the Epic. The Bhārata tale alone would remain after this second lightening of foreign elements, but by no means the original tale; for we must bear in mind that the second principle of increase, the natural evolution of old scenes, was at work contemporaneously with the dynamic principle of insertion. Thus, after discarding the foreign elements in any one of the battle-books, we have in our strictly Bhārata residuum not simply the Bhārata tale of old, but that tale expanded by repetition, colored by new descriptions, etc., all at one with the story, but increasing its extent. A certain amount of elimination can doubtless be done here by striking out repeated scenes; but it will be at best an unconvincing critique. In some cases, as in the fourth book, we have a perhaps original episode of the Pāndus seeking alliance at Upaplavya first expanded, and then added to by absurd and unnatural scenes betraying of themselves their lateness; yet we should do wrong to reject the book altogether on this account. Comparing again with the Rāmāyaṇa, we see that the most conspicuous difference between the poems is this: that while the Epic is not wanting in scenes romantic enough to lie parallel to the general tone of the Rāmāyaṇa, the latter is totally wanting in those scenes and touches, familiar to the Epic, that reveal a period older than either poem taken as a whole. But, again, the general character and style of our Epic approaches nearest to that of the other poem in the battle-scenes; so that, were the characters exchanged, we could scarcely say from the general description whether we were reading of the war of Arjuna or of that of Rāma. The Mahābhārata, then, in such portions clearly stands on a par with the Rāmāyaṇa; although, on the one side, there are Epic points untouched in antiquity by Vālmīki's poem, and, on the other, there are smaller points of dress and implements in the latter that seem to indicate posteriority to the Epic.

---

* In i. 1. 75 ff. the çlokas are 8800; in the first version the thirteenth and the last two books of our present edition are not mentioned. In ib. 101 (*b*) ff. we read: *idaṁ çatasahasraṁ tu lokānām* (*çlokānām*) *puṇyakarmaṇām, upākhyānāiḥ saha jñeyam ādyaṁ Bhāratam uttamam; cāturviṁçatisāhasrīṁ cakre Bhārata-saṁhitām, upākhyānāir vinā tāvad Bhārataṁ procyate budhāiḥ* (the first verse is omitted in the Calcutta edition); and in 107 we learn that the present length of the Epic as established among men is 100,000 verses, as opposed to the Bhārata of 24,000 verses, mythical ones, and the compilation in its shortest form of 150 verses just mentioned.

† The significance of a certain appearance of greater antiquity in the pseudo-Epic will be discussed below.

To sum up the view that seems to me most free from objections, and least radically destructive of such tradition as does not on its face demand total unacceptance—I am inclined to think that our Epic originally described what it in general now pretends to describe, a war between the Kurus and the Pāndus united with the Panchālas. This war occurred later than the Brahmanic literary period, but before the general acceptance of Vishnuism. Songs and ballads kept alive and popularized the history of the triumph of the Pāndus over the Kurus, who were naturally described as sinful. When the conquerors had died, and the war was already fading into history, the priests composed a metrical account of the events, incorporating the old current songs and ballads. With the steady rise of Vishnuism, and later of Çivaism, these theologies implanted themselves at the hands of the priests in the poem, crowding out for the most part the song-kept Brahmaism of the older period. With the development of morality, the priests sought to explain away the evil deeds of their heroes; for they could not with one breath exhort to virtue, and with the next extol those that disregarded their rules of virtue. But the evil deeds of their heroes' foes they allowed to remain, since these men were sinners anyway, and served as types of such. Furthermore, they ranked the exploits of their heroes higher by uniting them, now that time enough had elapsed to confuse the past, with the great heroes of antiquity, perhaps helped in their pretense by a fortuitous likeness of names. The *gāthās*, or songs of war-like deeds of kings, became absorbed into the *itihāsa*, or legendary tale, now used in its new sense of a story told *per se* and not as part of a religious rite. With this change, all completeness of the individual scenes vanished. The necessary links of connection became lengthened into new chains of stories. The moralizing tendency, in this weakening of the poem, now began to involve the whole tale. The work became thus on the one hand a great collection of 'various stories' grouped about the main story of 'the goodness of the Pāndus and badness of the Kurus,' and on the other a compendium, if the word be allowed, of all moral teachings; while a new religion acted on tale and moral alike, and rendered it finally the holiest of books, 'a new Veda, more weighty than all the Vedas.'*

---

* i. 1. 3, 11, 100, 254, 266 ff. The latest historical audacity of the priests was probably to unite the two families of foes as cousins, in order to obtain a respectable genealogy for the Pāndus. These genealogical lists, such as i. 75 ff., have the appearance of age, but were probably often forged. It was customary to recite them on state occasions. For an attempt to discover the Vedic beginnings of some Epic legends, see Bradke, Z. D. M. G. xxxvi. 474; Oldenberg, ib. xxxvii. 54; xxxix. 52 ff., 79. For two scenes in the Epic compared with the Shâh-Nâmah, see Darmesteter, *Journ. Asiat.* viii. 38 ff., 52. For reference to Weber's quotations on the musical elements of the Epic, see the last paragraph of this paper.

## II. HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE EPIC.

In a land without history, legend becomes dangerously ennobled. We are driven to tales, senseless or sober, for the information that should properly come from record and statute. It is not to be denied that herein lies the possibility of perverting what results we have obtained, and of forcing a pictorial truth to serve as a historical statement. Nevertheless, although we must repudiate as unsound any chronological deductions drawn from Hindu story (for I do not believe that we can credit any of the professedly trustworthy genealogies given in the Epic), although we must confess that we neither know nor can know whether the tales of kings related in the Epic are to be relied upon at all, or in what degree they may be worthy of confidence, yet the main thread of the story and the network of legend with which it is entangled do certainly present opportunity for useful research from the sociological point of view; being in so far of historical worth as it is possible through this means to obtain a view of social relations that by the indigenous writers have been conceived as true, and may, therefore, rightly appear to us as probable. Again, although we labor in the Hindu Epic under the disadvantage of finding united as if in themselves coherent social conditions that plainly belong to many different dates, yet by circumspection we can distinguish fairly well between old and new, and secure two pictures of life that, if not absolutely, are yet relatively historical, and (comparing parallel literature) can illustrate what without over-confidence we may conceive to have been the conditions of social life in India at two periods: the first, that of the half-developed state of about two thousand five hundred years ago; the second, posterior to this by perhaps a thousand years, with portions newer still, bringing the final date to a period far later than our era.*

To what extent we may make use in our investigation of the didactic sections contained in the Epic, is a question open to several answers. These portions are of course of late origin. Yet in a land so conservative as India we must concede that the gist of such dogmatic discourses had probably been for a long time the result of assumed and common custom, especially when the formal law of the early period essentially corroborates it; for law, as the Hindu is fond of saying, is based on custom; and custom, by the same authority, is unchangeable family or clan usage. Hence undisputed assertions specifying this or that as current custom may safely be supposed to have been based on traditions far older than the formulas in which they are handed down. But we must, of course, be conservative against allowing a too great elasticity of time in this regard. Such concrete examples of political wisdom and *bon mots* of polity are worthless except as possible embodiments of older usage; for they include much that the Epic proper does not touch upon, and that could not have been contained in the earlier version. Political or social truths, therefore, involved in many of these sayings can be predicated positively only of the period following the composition of the original poem, and asserted as universal only when strengthened by legal evidence of greater antiquity, or by support in Epic practice. For a true interpretation of the large collection of inferable and formally stated sociological data in the Epic, it is necessary to draw first a sketch of the old and then of the new world thereby presented. It stands to reason that in general much will here be found doubtful and open to criticism; and that, in particular, a certain meagreness will characterize the first, a comparative richness and perhaps suspicious fullness of detail the second picture.

---

* Lassen believes the Epic not much changed since Buddha's time. Few can now allow this. Compare *Ind. Alt.* i. 589.

But even the modern Epic, the full completed work—were we to deny to the student the chance of discriminating accurately between the bodies of material necessary to the making up of his two sketches—is not as a whole unimportant in the elucidation of the customs of India in the Middle Ages, reaching back more than two thousand years; though it may be that further study will necessitate our giving a much later date than has been assumed to much of the pseudo-Epic. Further, the impossibility of effecting a complete discrimination of old and new may make it seem to some a vain task to distinguish the factors by their age. It is true that our verdict as to which is early and which is late must in a measure be based upon purely *a priori* assumptions; while it should, where this is possible, certainly be dependent upon an intimate acquaintance with the literature preceding and following the Epic; for many of the threads of our poem are older than its present literary form, and have often been preserved as fragments caught in a substance foreign to them; while what influence, on the other hand, of other sects or other races has made itself felt in the re-weaving of the tale needs careful analysis, being yet far from determined. But a review of what the Epic tells us may, it seems to me, be serviceable in supplying facts that in turn may help the critique of the Epic itself, after these have been compared with results drawn from other sources. I have therefore collected the Epic data as positive aids to research, but as historical material would use them at present only tentatively.

## III. SOCIAL POSITION OF THE RULING CASTE.

I have called the warrior-caste the ruling caste of India, because all power, political as well as martial, lay in the hands of the military organization.

The hold that the priest obtained upon the king has been compared with that secured by the European priest in the Middle Ages. There is a great and essential difference. The Hindu priests had no strength of combination. They formed no union of political power parallel to, and capable of opposing itself as a whole against, the sovereignty of the throne. It is true that they formed an association, that they were an exclusive and distinct class. But they formed no corporate body, and had no head. They worked as individuals. Moreover, their power possessed no financial basis such as that of the Roman church. They drew no direct and constant property-contributions from the people. They were dependent on the king. From him they obtained largesses; from him, or rich members of his caste, they obtained their wealth of cattle and later of land: wealth that did not, however, go to swell a general fund, but enriched favored individuals. They lived on charity, and stood under armed patronage. Their very exclusiveness hindered their upgrowth; for had they with the religious tools familiar to them been able to ally themselves by marriage with the nobles, had the priests' daughters (for by their law celibacy was forbidden) wedded the priests' protectors, the religious order might by such family alliance have gained a thorough control of the state. As it chanced, mighty as was the individual ministerial influence of certain priests, coercive as was the religious power they could wield, they still stood apart from the rulers, depending on those whom (it is only fair to say) they despised—a fragmentary class, that enforced respect as a whole through fear of the fate to come upon the king that denied their influence with the gods, but never a class that rose to be independent of that king in respect of support. Moreover, as matter of fact, most of the priests lived retired and quiet lives, content to beg for food, satisfied with a little rice, cows, and a hut, and without worldly ambition; regarded with love or awe by the common outside world, with honor by the nobles, and only occasionally, in the person of the king's private priest and advisers, interfering at all in the matters that concerned the warrior-caste.

This view is of course not brought forward in the law-books. Their authors were the later priests, who regarded the world as made for them alone, and looked upon the king as a steward divinely appointed to provide them with what they needed. Far otherwise appears the Aryan state in the early Epic. A freer life is found here. The king is a king, not an appendage to the priest. The view of the formal law reflects the vain ideas of men conscious of mental superiority and anxious to bring the state into harmonious relations with their egotism. The Epic, an unconscious mirror, furnishes social facts as found in an age as yet comparatively independent, and portrays conditions that survived even the unscrupulous handling of the text by those opposing this independence. 'The priest is the standard of the world,' says the formal law; 'the king is the standard,' says the Epic.*

In looking at the state from a political point of view, we must, therefore, reverse the arrangement formally proclaimed by the priests themselves, and put their order below that of the military caste. And next came the 'people.'

There were, thus, three Aryan castes in the Epic period. The ruling caste, comprising the king, his great lords and vassals, together with the knightly part of the army; the priestly caste, elevated by religious knowledge, often individually powerful as guiders of the king's will, but otherwise forming a lowly class of penitents and beggars, who, if not irritated into a wasp-like wrath by unprovoked insult, remained a sedate, humble, and morally useful element in the state; lastly the third caste, called collectively the people, exalted only through their Aryan blood and their fully allowed claim to all Aryan privileges in the matter of legal rights and religious rites, but otherwise constituting a body that was looked upon with contempt by the military and extolled only by the priests. These knew the source of revenue.† There was, too, another and un-Aryan caste, of which the members were, to the Aryan 'twice-born' (re-generate through holy ceremonies), merely 'once-born,' or 'deprived of good birth.' These had, barring pretense, no spiritual or legal privileges.‡ They possessed no property. Their wives were so in name. Their lives depended on their owner's pleasure. They were 'born to servitude,' for they 'came from the foot of God.'* They were in fact the remnant of a displaced native population, marked by race-characteristics and stigmatized by their conqueror's pride as a people apart, worthy only of contempt and slavery. It would at times appear as if the slave were the especial servant of the people-caste, although bound also to serve the other high castes (i. 100. 11; but compare xii. 72. 4–8, 6=M. i. 99). The color-distinction between the castes—the slave being black; the people, yellow; the warrior, red; the priest, white (xii. 188. 5; in ii. 36. 24 *kālapūga* means time, not color)—may possibly indicate a real difference of hue (compare Muir, S.T. i. 140; Zimmer, A. L. p. 113, with literature). The people in general, both those of the country (*jānapada*) and those of the town (*paura*), are divided into the 'people at large and the common people' (*mahājana, pṛthagjana;* cf. xii. 321. 143; xiv. 90. 14) as distinguished *en masse* from the aristocrats, and so may include the people-caste proper and its leavings—that is, those following or adopting occupations too low to be recognized as fit for Aryans (under which name the three upper castes or the people-caste alone are meant). The statement that 'there is no distinction of castes' is meant proleptically, and implies merely that a man changes his caste in future births on earth in accordance with his acts in this; so that e. g. a priest 'might become yellow and be born as a member of the people-caste,' if he failed to act as a priest should (*māitrāyaṇagataḥ;* xii. 188. 10 ff.; cf. ib. 239. 13; 279. 5).† I prefer to keep the significant, if not absolutely correct, translations of the caste names rather than their native forms: thus, 'priest' for *brāhmana* ‡ 'warrior' for *kṣatriya* ('man of the ruling order'); 'man of the people' for *vaiçya* (literally 'inhabitant,' or, in the Vedic sense of *viç*, a 'clansman' in general; but later confined to members of such families of the Aryan folk as had not renounced farming

---

* Manu xi. 85: *brāhmaṇaḥ - - pramāṇaṁ lokasya*; Mbh. i. 82. 18: *rājā pramāṇam bhūtānām.* The law and Epic give a well known rule to the effect that the right of way belongs to a blind man, a woman; a burden-bearer, and a king; while, if a king and priest meet, the way belongs to the priest (Vās. xiii. 59; Āp. ii. 5. 11. 6; M. ii. 138–9; Mbh. iii. 133. 1; xiii. 104. 25, etc.); but the same Epic recounts a scene where a king meeting a priest calls out to him 'get out of my way' (*apagaccha patho 'smākam*), and when the priest repeats the 'law eternal,' as just quoted, it is without effect, and the king even smites him with his whip. The king is cursed by the priest and becomes a demon. but this 'law' and anecdote of Vasishtha may serve as an example to illustrate the gradual increase in priestly power, and the means by which it was obtained.

† Compare v. 132. 30: 'Let the priest beg; the knight defend the people; the people-caste make money; the slave be a server'; or xii. 91. 4: 'work is for the slave; agriculture, for the people-caste.'

‡ *Na hi svam asti çūdrasya* etc., xii. 60. 37: compare the whole section; with 39, Pāijavana, cf. M. vii. 41. The slave might clean up after the offerings were made (*çūdrāir nirmārjanaṁ kāryam*, xii. 294. 12–15;

---

his glory is *dākṣya* (activity), to obey the three castes his duty (21); cf. 295. 1 ff.: a priest who becomes *çūdradharman* is degraded; the slave becomes a herdsman, however, or a tradesman, if he cannot support himself by service (3, 4); 297. 27 ff.=M. x. 126 ff.: cf. xiii. 165. 10. The pseudo-Epic also declares the slave to be the next removed from a beast (xiii. 118. 24), but in its religious portions admits that a slave may, like the other castes, get a reward for fasting (*upoṣita*, xiii. 132. 14); just as it says that one of the slave-caste may be made a student (*çrāvayec caturo varṇān kṛtvā brāhmaṇam agrataḥ*, xii. 328. 49) though the *parīkṣeta* rule precedes (47). The caste will be later treated in detail.

*It is an old myth that the people-caste came from the loins or thighs of God (Brahmā or Manu), while the warrior-caste came from his arms, the priestly, from his head (mouth), and the slave-caste from his foot: RV. x. 90. 12; law, Vās. iv. 2; B. i. 10. 18. 6; Epic, Mbh. viii. 32. 43 ff.; xii. 60. 28 ff.; 319. 90; R. iii. 20. 30 ff. (here from Manu).

†Compare Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, i. 138 ff. for this religious view and some quotations on caste-color.

‡Compare Latin *flamen;* see von Bradke, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der vorhistorischen Entwickelung unseres Sprachstammes*, p. 13.

and trading to live an altogether military or priestly life); 'slave' for *çūdra*. Out of these elements was made the theoretical state of the Hindus. Yet earlier only the three upper castes were recognized as *tout le monde*.* Practically, there came in addition an early recognized and large number of 'mixed castes,' feigned all to have been either degraded branches of the pure castes or their illegitimate descendants. (Compare e. g. xii. 297. 8, 9.) In reality these were outcasts, made so either formally or naturally (through the increasing tendency of the lower orders to take up means of livelihood not sanctioned by the pure), or, far more, remnants of un-Aryan tribes gradually assimilating to the body politic of their conquerors, but not received into the social or religious body. These were increased, again, by ever growing immigration from strictly foreign nations of warriors and traders, practically esteemed but otherwise despised.†

But from people-caste, slave-caste, pariahs, or foreigners the ruling caste held itself at less or greater intervals aloof. The warriors mingled with the people-caste, indeed, but not by preference. Intercourse with all below this line was held with the mutual understanding that such union was temporary, and tolerable only on the ground of expediency. On the contrary, the priestly and knightly castes were always together, for ill or good. But in either case they were distinguished as the aristocracy from all others, more or less plebeian. They fought bitterly, and learned each the other's strength. They became friendly, joined on the basis of mutual advantage, and from that time on were as one, above the lower order.

---

* Compare *etāvad vā idaṁ sarvaṁ yāvad brahma kṣatraṁ viṭ*, Çat. Br. (ii. 1. 4. 12) iv. 2. 2. 14; Weber, *Ind. Studien*, x. 18.

† Compare xii. 207. 41–45, for the disesteem felt for foreigners; xiv. 73. 25, for the distinction between Kirātas, Yavanas, with other barbarians, and Aryans; or vi. 9. 61, etc.; and xiii. 48 and 49 for the whole account of the mixed castes. The recoil from strangers is not much greater, however, than that of high caste from low caste in the developed state: 'equals with equals: let priests talk with priests; warriors, with warriors; men of the people, with men of the people; slaves, with slaves,' xii. 210. 11–12. Yet in a moral sense even the mixed castes are better than the pure if the latter do not do as they ought, iii. 180. 25–36. The high estimation in which certain foreigners, such as the Yavanas, were held is wholly due to the military point of view (see below). Aside from this accident they were all despicable, no matter whence they came, although the Madrakas were chief in positive unholiness and in the anti-Aryan character of their civilization. The Northerners in general were as bad as the rest. The sole exception is that of the storied Northern Kurus. These were looked upon as occupying an earthly Hyperborean paradise. The flank of Mount Meru is in one place given as their home (*dakṣiṇena tu nīlasya meroḥ pārçve tatho 'ttare*, vi. 7. 2), but they are regarded as real people of the North in most cases, with laws more conservative than the Southerners (as in i. 122. 7), and blessed with a typical felicity (as in the first passage, and R. ii. 103. 26): so blessed in fact that while some happy heroes go at death to Indra's heaven, others go to the Northern Kurus (xv. 33. 13 ff.), as a sort of earthly heaven. A gate sixteen *yojanas* wide used to be blocked up and prevent their passage; but they can now pass through (iii. 231. 98). It is evident that they were half-real, half-mythical to the Epic poets. Other foreigners are simply barbarians, on a par with the Dasyus, which latter race may be blessed only by changing its way of life and becoming an adherent of Aryan rules (xii. 135. 22, etc.). Rather noteworthy is the *tutoyer* (*tvaṁkāra*) of a seer by a slave in iii. 137. 5–6, and by a Cāndāla (*tam uvāca sa cāṇḍālo maharṣe çṛṇu me vacaḥ*, xii. 141. 55. Compare 85, *bhavān*, and conversely, Viçvāmitra to the Çvapaca *bhavān* in 66, *tvam* in 80) though the custom is to exchange 'thou' with 'sir' without ceremony. But the rule is that, though persons younger or of the same age may be addressed with 'thou,' neither 'thou' nor the real name should be said to those that are better (older). Compare xii. 193. 25 (*tvaṁkāraṁ nāmadheyaṁ ca jyeṣṭhānām arivarjayet*, etc.)

But how were all these classes politically united? What part had each in the state-organization? Whence, above all, came the huge revenues necessary to the establishment of a fighting force liable to be called out at any time, and too proud itself to subsist on its own manual labor?*

At a time such as that represented by the first story of the Epic, the warrior was always a robber and pillager. This life was the knight's support. Forays and cattle-lifting provided needed gain. Meantime, although occasionally called into the field, the people (such I name the united 'clansmen' whom conservatism partly retained, and the pride of others forced into a caste) continued the peaceable occupations once shared alike by all members of the folk, and were enabled to build up that substantial wealth that was to make them the later support of the state. But, as time went on, the levies upon the people's wealth, that during an age when feud was the constant condition had been rare, irregular, and generally unnecessary, became with growing civilization more frequent. The king no longer raids along the border. He lives in a walled town, surrounded by a court of polished nobles. War is a serious business, and means often not an attack on out-lying savage races, but a campaign against another Aryan realm grown powerful and civilized as his own. Moreover, as the country becomes settled, the pastime of hunting serves to amuse the war-men in the intervals of fighting, and a costly idle court must be maintained. The people of the country, no longer obliged to retire daily to the mud-built 'fort' for protection from the barbarians, spread themselves over the land in open ranches or half-defended villages, to protect which outposts of soldiers are established, new forts are built, and so new towns developed, but always with increasing expense to the people at large and particularly to the people-caste, in whose hands rests the potential basis of supplies. Larger and larger grow the flocks of the ranchmen; a busier traffic arises. The knights are heavy consumers of wealth, but must be supported. The court and its army become a great load. And now regular and oppressive taxes begin to fall upon the supporting caste. War or peace, funds must come into the royal treasury. These funds are drawn from the people-caste. The king is the 'keeper of wealth' (*vittarakṣin*, xii. 321. 143) as opposed to the 'common people'; but these furnish it, and then come to beg of him in need.

---

* The military-caste-man, if poor, might become a farmer, but only as a resource in need (see below). Otherwise he could be made to work manually only in order to pay a fine: M. ix. 229.

The settlements, it may be observed, of the Aryan population may be classed in three divisions. The largest, called city or town (*nagara*, *pura*), was an outgrowth of the village (*grāma*, *kheṭa*), and is represented as walled; while the village is a collection of houses around a fort (*durga*). The village itself is often no more than the natural development of the *ghoṣa*, or cattle-ranch, which the king is bound to have guarded, and seems to have converted in favorable places into a small village by erecting a fort like that around which the *grāma* naturally arose (compare xii. 69. 35). With this *ghoṣa*, and on a par with it, are sometimes mentioned the small barbarian settlements called *pallī* (*pallīghoṣāḥ*, xii. 326. 20). The radical difference between the *ghoṣa* and *grāma* appears to be usually not so much quantitative as qualitative. The *grāma*, being the earliest form of settlement, presupposes a *durga* or fort (defense) of some kind as its nucleus; while the *ghoṣa* (sometimes called *vraja*) is an outpost from city or village, and a cow-pen developed into a ranche, and hence into a village by the addition of a fort to protect it after it had become a centre of population. The word *grāma* is not, however, invariably applied to a natural growth from within, but may be used of a community artificially planted, as in ii. 5. 81, where we read: 'to defend a city, towns (villages) are made, like unto the city; and border-villages (*prāntāḥ*), like unto the towns' (though for *grāmavac ca kṛtāḥ prāntāḥ* the Calcutta edition reads *grāmavac ca kṛtā ghoṣāḥ*, 215). Characteristic of India is the recall the country, to guard against drought (ii. 5. 77). How the ommendation in this same passage of ponds, to be built over 'cow-pen' may practically become a village is illustrated verbally in the use of *goṣṭha*, etymologically a 'cow-pen.' This word is used of any general assembly, as in the proverbial verse: 'The joy of him that liveth in a village is the mouth of death; but the god's cow-pen (the place where gods assemble) is the lonely forest.'* As to the constitutional power of the villages, we have no reason to believe that they had any political rights beside the liberty given to them by the royal overseer. It is, however, an aphorism of the legal literature that villages shall be their own authority in matters so especially private or of such family interest as the observances at weddings and funerals. In such case no foreign rite is to be imposed, but local usage shall obtain (Pār. G. S. i. 8. 13).

---

* xii. 175. 25 (b) = 278. 26 (a); 26 (b) = *nibandhanī rajjur eṣā yā grāme*, etc. *Çruti*, as often, is merely 'a saying,' a proverb. Like this is iii. 200. 92: 'Wherever learned priests are, that is a city, whether they live in a *vraja* (village) or a forest.' Did Sir William Jones get his poem 'What constitutes a state? Not high walled battlements or labored mound, Thick wall or moated gate, but men', etc., from this passage?

But it is by no means the Hindu conception of the king's office that the people-caste exists to support it while the throne is free of responsibility. No theory could have appeared more absurd to the Aryan law-givers. The people-caste is a part of the Aryan population, and must not be oppressed. The connection between the king and the people-caste is based on a theory of mutual advantage. The people-caste must be taxed; but the relation between the taxing and taxed parties is always explained in a way evidently calculated to appeal to the latter's business sense. That relation is, in a word, trade. A barter, as is often candidly said, of so much movable property for so much protection. Two things men desire—security and wealth. The people-caste has the latter and wants the former; the military-caste wants the latter and can provide the former. Let us trade, then, says the Hindu, and on the following basis. The taxes shall be low when no danger is at hand. When war is expected, the price of security rises; the levies on the people's wealth shall be greater. The king shall maintain a standing army, and make all the sacrifices necessary to keep the gods in good humor. For this the people shall pay. In return the king shall undertake to keep guard over the country, and defend the agricultural and mercantile classes not only from foes without but from foes within, making good their losses by theft in time of peace, and in time of war keeping them safe from harm, agreeing to become responsible for their sins in the next world if he fails in this after having exacted taxes. The king was thus held responsible to the people for his part of the bargain, and suffered a penalty if he did not fulfil his contract. In small matters, as for instance where a merchant had his goods stolen, the king (his servants) had first to seek for the thief; but if he was not found, the money had to be refunded from the treasury. In event of a great war with defeat, however, where it was absolutely impossible for the king to return the property lost, the people had the satisfaction of knowing that a portion of their sins, or, so to speak, their debts to hell, had been transferred to account of the

---

Compare vs. 90: *prākārāiç ca puradvārāiḥ prāsādāiç ca pṛthagvidhāiḥ, nagarāṇi na çobhante hīnāni brāhmaṇottamāiḥ*, etc. According to the Ag. P. the *kharvaṭa* is a town in size between city and village (256. 18); this appears to be unknown to the Epic.

king's soul, and in this way some compensation would be theirs hereafter, if not in this life, for the king's failure to fulfil his legal obligation of protecting.*

Such is the view most frequently assumed and expressed when the relations between the business classes and the king are discussed. Such a class as this third caste needs, therefore, to be very definitely determined in its social and political limits before we can make an absolute estimate of the ruling or kingly caste. In fact, the latter's power can be best shown by finding first the relative position of the people in respect of the state at large. What then was the people-caste?

The priestly caste formed an undivided whole, except for internal distributions of studies, whereby one member learned more than another of some special branch of a pursuit equally open to all. Except for the king's family-priest, and the election of certain members of the caste to offices bestowed by the king, one member was politically the same as another. The warrior-caste, except for plutocratic distinctions, and the special ability acquired by special members in special acts of warfare, was also a political unit. The slave-caste consisted of so many equal-reckoned slaves. But not so with the people-caste. Here we have class within caste in three well-organized bodies, radically different in their occupations and socially apart. These three bodies met, indeed, on the common basis of their Aryaship in a theoretical view of the state; and the narrower bond of their mutual origin from that part of the people that had gradually confined itself to a business life brought them closer together than they stood as a whole when opposed to the priests or the warriors. But for all that, they were not one body with like aims and needs. Their three subdivisions were, historically, as follows. First, the great body of ranchmen, the cattle-raising population, with their dependants, the herdsmen and cow-

---

*As the king is personally responsible for the good conduct of the state, any sums stolen in his realm become his debts to the loser. The amount stolen must be refunded either from his own purse (*svakoçāt*) or 'from some one that supports himself:' that is, he should take it from some wealthy member of the people-caste (the commentator suggests 'a trader'). The financial responsibility is thus later put upon the poor people-caste, but the spiritual loss is the king's and his ministers' (xii. 75. 8, 10, 12; no restriction of priest's property is made here, but may be implied by the context 'all is saved if the priest is saved'). As to the ministers' share, compare xii. 65. 28 ff.; 66. 32 ff.: 'Godlike is the king, and gods revere a just one; the king shares the reward given hereafter for the virtue of the folk; but the evil he shares also; so do the ministers.' 'He that steals from the king himself goes to hell; his property is confiscated; his body, slain,' is the converse. The confiscated property of persons not thieves returns to the family (below: and ib. 96. 6, N.). The passage above gives the king's titles as Ruler, Generous One, Wide-Ruler, All-Ruler, Warrior, Lord of Earth, Protector of Men. The king refunds by the rule of Ag. P. 252. 62.

boys. Next, the agriculturists or farmers, who raised grain, and their smaller imitators, who raised fruit and vegetables. Last, the whole trading population, whether on sea or land, continually having intercourse with foreign traders, whether traveling about the country in caravans or located in one town.

Beside these three divisions, there is a continual row of smaller similar occupations, leading by insensible degrees into the work formally declared to be unfit for Aryans. First, perhaps, money-lending may be mentioned; which, if not an early departure, was one that shows us the gradual extension of caste-functions; for we can still trace its despised appearance, and gradual encouragement, till it is finally received as a legitimate occupation for the twice-born. Here lies, too, the whole mass of mechanics, artizans, carpenters, peddlers, and the like; and the frequent denunciation of those that have embraced such occupations shows us clearly how often the line between respectable and objectionable labor was crossed by Aryans. Such commingling of Aryan and un-Aryan must have begun very early; and I fancy that in the earliest period of the Epic the people-caste had already a more and more uncertain line dividing it from the vulgar—a view supported by the circumstance cited below, that this caste is, in spite of Arya-ship, apt to be set along with the slave-caste against the two more exclusively Aryan castes of the warriors and priests.* The formal law in enumerating the three (recognized) classes of the people-caste sometimes reverses the order, and puts the trading-class before the cattle-raisers. This is not only historically wrong, but is contradicted by the arrangement elsewhere preferred in the native texts. In fact, it is even stated that raising cattle is the only business fit for the people-caste, and that any other occupation is wrong.†

---

* I do not mean that the army did not also contain a host of un-Aryans. These never commingled and grew together as did the people-caste and the outsiders, but were always oil and water in one jar.

† 'A man of the people should bestow gifts, go over the holy texts, make sacrifice, and get wealth; in doing which let him take care of cattle, and be devoted to them as a father is to his sons; any other business that he performs would be for him a wrong business, since the Creator entrusted cattle to the people-caste' (xii. 60. 23; 23–24 = M. ix. 327). The law, which allows a priest that cannot support himself to follow the occupation of the third caste, also specifies agriculture before trade (which the priest may carry on only with certain limitations), but admits that many object to this pursuit (for a priest) on account of the necessary cruelty involved—the plough injuring the creatures in the earth, and the yoke hurting the cattle (iii. 208. 23, *ahiṇsā:* cf. i. 63. 11, the ideal place where 'they do not yoke miserable cattle': cf. M. x. 83; Gāut. x. 3 ff.). This objection is also brought against agriculture by the trader or 'scales-man' (*tulādhāra*), whose own boast is that his 'scales are the same for everybody,' while he also objects to raising cattle, because it is necessary to castrate them and bore their nostrils (xii. 263. 1, 6, 11, 37). Compare Pār. G. S. i. 69 for late inversion of trades.

Once the folk at large, the united clansmen of the Aryan people, the people-caste had thus lost its ancient universal practices and become confined to industry and trade. Gradually, from when each warrior was rich in cattle and each cattle-raiser ready to answer to a call for arms, there came a separation of interests. Some grew to depend on their bows and swords, and, finding fighting more agreeable than labor of hands, settled more and more upon the life which the king lived, and took him as their model. They became 'king's men,' the older name of those forming the warrior-caste. They arose from the people and left them. Some, again, confined themselves to study and religion, and before long gained and kept the fame of being the gods' special ministers. They also arose from the people and left them. And so the 'clansmen' or 'people' grew socially smaller and became the people-caste—in name the whole, in fact a part, and a rapidly degrading part of the population. But a shadow of their former might remained far into the Epic period. Of this, below. The three occupations, already developed in the Vedic age, now abandoned by the warriors and priests, were cherished by the people-caste. Indeed, so rapidly do we find the subdivisions appearing in the light of demarcated professions that we even notice a differentiation between the people-caste on the one hand and the traders on the other, showing that agriculture and cattle seemed still more peculiarly the people's work.*

But the development of commercial interests was sufficient ultimately to cause the establishment of a sort of trade-unions or guilds. These may belong in their full development to a late period, but we find them mentioned early (so in the law-book of Manu) as of importance. Such corporations had their own rules and laws subject to the king's inspection, the king not being allowed (theoretically) to have established or to establish any laws that contradicted those already approved or sanctioned by usage. The heads of these corporations are mentioned together with the priests as political factors of weight, whose views are worth grave consideration; as an informal instance of which, we find a prince defeated in battle and ashamed to return home—'for what,' he exclaims, 'shall I have to say to my relatives, to the priests, and to the heads of the corporations?'[*] Prominence is given to the guilds in the later books of the Epic. There also we find corporations of every sort, under the name of *gana;* of the members of which the king is particularly recommended to be careful, since enemies are apt to make use of them by bribery. But dissension is their weak point. Through dissension and bribery they may be controlled by the king. On the other hand, 'union is the safeguard of corporations.'[†] The power of the corporations is said to be equal to that of all the king's military dependents; 'these two, I think, are equal,' it is said in a passage where the strength of the kingdom is reckoned (unless the dependents include servants of every kind).[‡]

---

* 'There the men of the people (*vāiçyāḥ*) do not injure cattle, nor do the merchants (*vaṇijaḥ*) deal with false weights (*kūṭamānāiḥ*, i. 64. 21–22).' It is for pictorial effect that we more often have the sea-trader than the land-trader spoken of in the Epic, the 'merchant wrecked with ship destroyed' being a much loved metaphor. Compare e. g. ix. 3. 5; R. v. 26. 12. Not a coaster but a deep-sea sailor is meant. Compare ii. 5. 114: 'Do the merchants that have arrived from afar for the sake of gain pay no more than their proper (shipping) duties?'

The intermingling of un-Aryan with Aryan in this caste is perhaps indicated by the fact that the cowboys, who watched for instance the royal cattle, spoke a dialect unintelligible to the Aryans, unless the latter had especially learned it.[§] Kings, of course, are always surrounded by interpreters; but this may be referred simply to the effect of the foreign population.[‖]

Two additions to the cattle-raising population are to be found outside of the people-caste. The king is himself a large owner and breeder of cattle, and personally superintends the condition of his flocks at certain times in the year. The whole care is taken, of course, by the cowboys, whose ranches the king visits, when for example the cattle are to be branded. Large gifts of kine are given to kings by foreign allies, and we can still trace pure cattle-raiding expeditions in the Epic story. Such given or stolen cattle were kept for the king. On the other hand, there is comparatively early evidence to show that the priests also, though not personally attending to the duties of the calling, yet carried on more or less cattle-raising and agriculture on their own account, employing the third caste to do the labor.

The third or people-caste has thus, as regards their duties, quite undefined borders. The humblest tender of cows for a master may be of this caste, or the work may be done by one outside the Aryan ranks. The priest and king share the gain of the profession, and practically intrude on the emoluments theoretically set apart for the people-caste.

---

[*] iii. 249. 16; xii. 54. 20. The *çreṇi* or guild thus includes unpriestly corporations. Cf. R. vi. 111. 13.

[†] xii. 107. 32; xii. 59. 49, *çreṇimukhyopājapena;* N. understands military *çreṇi*, M. viii. 41. An interesting list of trades is found R. ii. 90. 10 ff. In the same work the collocation of 'assemblies and corporations' is to be noted (*pariṣadaḥ çreṇayaç ca*, R. ii. 120. 5). The further distribution of a popular crowd implied in *sayodhaçreṇinigamaḥ* (*janaḥ*, R. ii. 12815) is apparently later than the Epic.

[‡] I should here be inclined to take *māula* as native soldiers, *bhṛta* as mercenaries, were it not for the commentator, xv. 7. 8.

[§] Their dialect, *bhāṣā*, has to be acquired by Aryans: iv. 10. 1.

[‖] *Sarvabhāṣāvidaḥ*, i. 207. 39: but *sarvabhāṣyavidaḥ*, xii. 321. 15.

What was the condition of the small farmers through the realm? We cannot say, further than in their relation to the state as tax-payers. Of the daily worker, shepherd, cowherd, farm-help, we have, however, a chance didactic verse that informs us in regard to his wage. In this passage the lowly laborer is a man of the people-caste: or rather, the people-caste is understood to consist of laborers, as a look at the context will show. After the common formula that the people-caste should tend cattle, we read: 'he should receive the milk of one cow for the care of every six; if he tend a hundred head of cattle, he should receive a pair; in the case of (dealing for the master of the) flocks or in agricultural labor, his general share should be one-seventh of the proceeds or of the increase, but in the case of small cattle (not horned) only a small part (one-sixteenth.')[*]

Although points of direct contact between the royal and people-castes are, except in the matter of taxation, rarely to be found in the Epic, yet the account of the distribution of the kingly power, as preserved in both Epic and legal literature, points to the fact that the people were in general at the mercy of the king's vicegerents, and that the people-caste must have been especially exposed to their predatory natures.[†]

In describing the 'care of the empire,' tradition divides the realm into seven factors. Of these the first five are the king himself, his ministers, the treasury, army, and allies; the last two are the country-people, and the capital, or 'the city.'[‡] In 'the city' the king (theoretically) superintended all duties, even to the adjustment of prices. He had delegates (whom he appointed through the land) to do this for him in other towns and villages. They were stationed chiefly as military commanders. We fortunately have preserved the system of government by which the towns lying out of the king's direct supervision were cared for. The decimal system of classification (found again in the army) is not necessarily a sign of late origin for this array of officials; but, though coinciding in all respects with the plan authorized by the legal treatises, since it represents as it must an imperial policy rather than that of a limited kingdom the inference is fair that the system was one adopted only after the foundation of great empires, belonging therefore to the later Epic.

---

[*] xii. 60. 24 ff., *tathā çṛṅge kalā khure.* The parentheses are due to the commentator. The amount given is the workman's 'yearly pay' (*sāṁvatsarī bhṛtiḥ*).

[†] The technical *ītayaḥ* or 'adversities' of the husbandman include, however, only foreign invasion (a point contradictory of Megasthenes' account). But see particularly Ag. P. 238. 46; and 262. These *ītayaḥ* are, I believe, not defined in the Epic by text or commentator, but are explained by a native lexicographer as consisting of 1. too much rain: 2. no rain; 3. grasshoppers; 4. mice or rats; 5. birds: 6. neighboring kings (invading the country). The Epic puts them with sickness as one of the 'faults' of a metaphysical division of things according to their qualities (iii. 149. 35); and alludes to them in the words of a speaker: *ītayaç ca na santi me* (v. 61. 17. For definition see P. W.).

[‡] xii. 69. 64 ff.; different order in xii. 321. 154–5. Compare M. ix. 294–297.

According to this system, the king with his town officers sees to the royal capital, while he is represented in other towns by men selected either from the priestly, the warrior, or the people-castes. It is the duty of these men to protect, each his village, their territory from robbers; more particularly, those that govern a village must keep it and the surrounding country to the distance of a *kroça* (about two miles) in all directions free from thieves, and are bound to repay to the losers whatever is stolen within this district. In the case of a large town the distance guarded is four times as great. They had also to collect the taxes from their districts.* The Epic describes the allotment of territory thus. Every town or village was presided over by a vicegerent, who was under a superior officer called 'ruler of twenty' towns or 'ruler of a hundred.' In a gradually extending circle these overseers received tribute, heard reports, passed them on to the one of next highest authority, and he to the next, till revenues and reports focused in the king, the lord of all. The king should create one over-lord to be the governor of a thousand villages (i. e. here as example, over the whole realm); all the villages are to be divided into groups, or departments, of one hundred villages each; these, again, are subdivided into counties of twenty each and ten each, while a head-man is to be appointed over each division, reckoning from the village as a unit. The head-man or mayor of each village (*grāmasya adhipatiḥ*) sends to the ten-village-man or county officer (*daçagrāmī*) returns of all the crimes committed in his village,† and the ten-village-man in turn sends his report to the twice-ten-man (*dviguṇāyī* or *viṅçatipaḥ*);‡ who in turn passes his collected reports to the hundred-village-man (*grāmaçatādhyakṣaḥ*), from whom they go to the general governor (*adhipatiḥ*). The officer in each division draws his own income from the province placed under his control: one village provides support for the village-man; the village-men from ten villages supply the ten-village-man, etc. The ruler of a hundred villages ought to have to supply his needs the revenue derived from one whole flourishing town, while the thousand-village-man has a large city, gold, grain, etc., appropriated to his use.*

---

* M. vii. 115–125; Yāj. i. 321; Āp. ii. 10. 26. 4ff.

† *Grāmadoṣāḥ*; probably the returns are sent monthly.

‡ The ruler of ten is also called *daçapaḥ*; and the ruler of one village, *grāmikaḥ*.

Beside these special supervisors, each city should be provided with one general officer, a mayor (?) or superintendent of affairs, whose official title is 'he-that-thinks-about-everything'; his duties are not defined.† A military garrison is stationed in every town and along the border-forts; and the realm is watched by military police, recommended as guards of the city parks (*purodyāna*) and other crowded places.‡ Such is the later 'defense of the realm,' as distinguished from the earlier single fort and environs.

Many of these cities are, of course, those brought under the sway of the king. We may assume, since the general officers here described are particularly urged not to exceed their powers, and to be tender-hearted toward the unfortunate (a plea often urged before kings, as in Nārada's great sermon in the Sabhā), that they exercised pretty free control and were apt to abuse it.§ In fact, with an uncertain rate of taxation, they could practically demand what they pleased. The proper rate of taxation is not certainly established in the Epic, but at its best was very severe. Agriculture is always implied. It is only in an ideal realm that we find 'in that place there was no confusion of castes, and no mining or agricultural labor.'*

---

* It is said in the second book that there are five general officers of the military caste in each town as collectors. What their exact functions were the Epic does not say (*kac cic chūrāḥ kṛtaprajñāḥ pañca pañca svanuṣṭhitāḥ, kṣemaṁ kurvanti saṁhatya rājan janapade tava*, ii. 5. 80; the contest shows that *pañca* refers to officers of towns). I suspect that collecting here refers to collecting the regular taxes. One thousand villages given away as a 'means of livelihood' is not uncommon in the time of the empires: compare e. g. R. ii. 31. 16. According to Manu the lord of ten villages has as much as can be cultivated by twelve oxen; of twenty villages, by five times that; of one hundred, the produce of a village; of a thousand, the revenue of a town. This certainly seems an older version than that of the Epic. The word *kula*, here employed, land enough for a family, is interpreted by the commentators as 'what can be ploughed by twelve oxen.'

† This 'one-thinker-about-everything' (*ekaḥ sarvārthacintakaḥ*) appears to be an additional officer, not a substitute for the city-lord; *vā* or *ca* is read, M. vii. 121–122. The description is found xii. 87. 1 ff. Military garrisons are spoken of ib. 69. 6 ff. They are to be stationed through the realm, and on the border-land.

‡ Compare ii. 5. 82 ff., 121, 114, where a garrison guards each town.

§ We learn little of these officers from the law. In M. x. 126; xi. 64 (Mbh. xiii. 165, 10; xii. 297. 25–26) the three upper castes have *adhīkāra*, but not the slave-caste; extending (in the Epic law) to any 'rule of right' (in Manu *adhīkāra* of law and of mines). But in the Epic practical rule we find the slaves have a certain authority (see below). These officers were, as were the king and all royal officers, exempted from certain ceremonial impurities (occasioned by the death of relatives) 'lest business be impeded (*kāryavirodhāt*) G. xiv. 45: M. v. 93–95. We find often that Hindu strictness in this regard is practically less than at first sight appears.

In practical life 'the king must not be too kind, he must not cut off his own root, he must tax as he finds necessary.'† The proper tax, to levy which the king is enjoined, and in taking which he 'does no wrong,' is in the proportion of one sixth of the annual gain got by the party taxed, with special rules for special cases. This regular rate is not regarded as imposing a heavy tax. Further statutes show that it may be increased, and permit even a fourth of the annual income to be so taken 'in time of need,' i. e. when danger threatens—the king in each case incurring the same proportion of the people's sins if he does not return the barter-value of this tax in 'protecting the people': especially, as is once sharply added, 'the better classes of people, and the wealthy classes.'‡

---

* i. 68. 6: *na varṇasaṁkaro na kṛṣyākarakṛj janaḥ.*

† v. 34. 18. The further advice that the king should be merciful toward his people 'as if toward the gods' (ib. 38. 41) is, as shown by many examples, based rather on the utilitarian principle that 'a realm is like a cow; it must not be over-milked' (xii. 87. 13–21), than on any principle of abstract right. An idea of what was reasonable in taxation may be drawn from the converse of a rule in regard to the king's expenditures. We are told that he ought to be every morning informed of what he has spent, and that his (yearly) expenditure ought not to cover more than three fourths of his income (ii. 5. 70–72). That is to say, he ought to tax heavily enough largely to increase his actual needs in private and public outlay. One half, one quarter, or three quarters, are given as the legitimate ratios of expense to income. The account is kept by 'calculators' (*gaṇakalekhakāḥ*).

‡ All traders' taxes, by legal and Epic rule, are to be apportioned according to the conditions under which the goods are presented for taxation: that is to say, a merchant's wares are to be taxed 'after the king has carefully considered the price at which they are to be sold, and were bought, and the distance they have been carried'; where an impost duty is intended. The artisan also must be taxed in such a way that 'both the king and the artisan may get profit.' Taxation more than 'legal' is decried; larger taxes must not be demanded, it is sometimes said, but begged for, and that from all the castes, except the priests (xii. 87. 13–21; 71. 15). But when the king conquers and is conscious that his taxes are not unjustly levied, then 'let the king address his new people, saying "give me the rightful tax;" if they give it, it is well; if not, let them be forced' (xii. 95. 2). The proper tax is formally given as above, i. 213. 9; xii. 24. 11 ff.; 69. 25; 139. 100. The yearly income is regarded as the basis of reckoning the tax in cattle-increase and grain-increase. Compare ii. 5. 78, and M. vii. 80. The Calcutta reading in ii. 212 (=5. 78) *pādikaṁ ca çatam* is certainly to be rejected for the Bombay *pratyekaṁ ca çatam.* The king is here advised to befriend the husbandmen when the crops are poor, and to take one in the hundred of the increase as a moderated equivalent of the normal tax; not to tax (more heavily than before) at the rate of twenty-five per cent. The possibility of the kingdom's existing without taxation seems especially to irritate the compilers of the pseudo-Epic. They revert to the subject again and again, and prove that the king must have wealth; his army, his happiness, his virtue depend on it; 'as a robe conceals a woman's nakedness, so does wealth conceal sin; therefore let him get wealth, even if he be sinful' (xii. 133. 7). The twelfth book says in effect to the

The authority of Megasthenes, if rightly reported, would induce us to believe that the agriculturists hold the land as tenants to the king, and that the gain of rents goes into the royal treasury, besides the payment of a fourth part of the crops as tax. Except on the principle of the Hindu proverb, that 'the cow (seemingly) belongs to the calf, the cowherd, the owner, and the thief, but he that gets the milk is the real owner' (xii. 174.32), we must decline *in toto* to accept this statement as valid for the times covered by the Epic narration, and, since they represent a more imperial policy than that depicted in the native works, conclude either that Megasthenes is misquoted in respect of land ownership and taxes, or that he speaks of a small part of the land where such custom prevailed, or writes of times different from that represented by Epic didactic poetry. Arrian says that Megasthenes saw only a little of India; but I am inclined to think that the present difference between the quarter and the sixth as a regular grain (income) tax indicates a difference of time rather than of locality, and that the Epic coinciding with the law represents in this point an ideal, or older state of affairs than that found by the Greek (c. 300 B. C.).*

---

king: 'rules do not hold in certain contingencies; do not ordinarily tax too much; but yet let your first care be to keep your treasury full; if it is necessary to tax heavily in order to this end, do so; money is the chief thing; wealth is a necessity; let the king imitate the people, they make as much as they can; for poverty is a crime' (xii.130.33 to end). The verse distinguishing between protection for the people in general and the better classes (xii. 24. 17, *çūrāç cāryāç ca satkāryā vidvāñsaç ca, . . . . gomino dhaninaç cāi' va paripālyā viçeṣataḥ*) is, despite the commentator, especially in the interest of the rich men of the people: 'Warriors, Aryans (the people-caste), and sages (priests) should all be treated well; those rich in cattle and those possessing property should be especially well protected.' As to the moral guilt incurred by a king through his people's sin see below. It is remarked in xiii. 61. 32 that 'the people ought to kill the rascal of a king who does not protect them' (*arakṣitāraṁ hartāraṁ viloptāram anāyakam, taṁ vai rājakaliṁ hanyuḥ prajāḥ saṁnahya nirghṛṇam*; in 33, *saḥ . . . . nihantavyaḥ*.

* Of the seven social orders that Megasthenes notes, the first is the order of priests; the second, the agriculturists, who greatly outnumber the others. These abstain from war, he says, and from all other public service, spending their time in agriculture; and no enemy injures the crops, because everyone looks on the agricultural class as a public benefactor—whence the richness of the uninjured land. He continues, as quoted by Diodorus and given above, with the words: *βιοῦσι δ' ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν γεωργόι, καὶ τῆς εἰς τὴν πόλιν καταβάσεως παντελῶς ἀφεστήκασι. Τῆς δὲ χώρας μισθοὺς τελοῦσι τῷ βασιλεῖ διὰ τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰνδικὴν βασιλικὴν εἶναι, ἰδιώτῃ δὲ μηδενὶ γῆν ἐξεῖναι κεκτῆσθαι· χωρὶς δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως τετάρτην εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν τελοῦσι.* In the next class Megasthenes rightly distinguishes from these farmers the herdsmen, shepherds, and poorer members of the people-caste; for though theoretically one, they were, as we have seen, in reality a different order; and we are not surprised to find no hint from the Greek observer that the two classes belong together. These poorer people, he says, are great hunters; they do not live in towns or villages, but *σκηνίτῃ δὲ βίῳ χρῶνται*: ev-

The statement that the king holds all the land as his own (and disposes of it as he will?) is not an unnatural deduction from the fact that the king may give away as much land as he likes, and is the 'lord of all' (compare Bühler on M. viii. 39). Still, practically the ownership is vested in each hereditary occupant; his right is secured by title; boundary disputes are settled by careful surveys; no sin is graver than 'depriving a priest of land,' nor any glory greater than 'giving land to a priest;' so that we may doubt if this right of universal ownership was exercised. No tax is put upon land: that is, no rent is paid for it. All the taxes of the law and Epic are arranged on the basis of increase in the year's stock, a part of which must be paid as tax; but it is nowhere implied that such a tax is regarded as rent for the land. The 'fourth part,' evidently declared by Megasthenes to be the proportion exacted, contradicts the perpetual statement of native authorities, that the proportion on grain is one-sixth, and one-fourth only in emergencies. Indeed, one of the standing epithets of the king is based on this proportion; he is called often the *ṣaḍbhāgin*, 'he that gets one-sixth.'* Such taxes in cattle, grain, and merchandise were levied in kind. Besides custom house duties, 'a piece in kind' for the king was exacted of merchants; that is, beside the apportioned duty, they surrendered one specimen of their goods to the royal treasury.†

---

idently the inhabitants of the *ghoṣa*. To complete this foreign description, we find the Greek's 'fourth class' to be what the Hindus call a part of the 'mixed castes'—namely, the artisans and manufacturers of implements, who pay no tax, but draw grain from the royal treasury: that is, if they are employed by the king as army artisans, or otherwise serviceable. Compare M. vii. 126, where from one to six *paṇas* a month, clothing every semester, and a tub of grain every month, are given to the menials of the royal household (as some say, the grain increasing with the money for the better servants). The tax of ordinary artisans is in kind, according to the native accounts. Megasthenes's class of warriors is touched on below; the sixth caste is that of the 'ephors,' probably the rulers described above: *οὑτοι δὲ πολοπραγμονοῦντες πάντα καὶ ἐφορῶντες τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἀπαγγέλλουσι τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν, ἐὰν δὲ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ἀβασίλευτος ᾖ, τοῖς αρχουσιν.* The last class is called the class of councilors, judges, etc. So Diodorus; and essentially the same, Arrian and Strabo. But it is important to notice that Arrian merely says in regard to the taxes of the agriculturists that 'they pay to the king or to autonomous cities the *φόροι*,' not specifying how much. Strabo says only that they rent the land, and pay one fourth of the crops in lieu of tax. Diod. ii. 40; Arrian, 11; Strabo, xv., p. 703 (Didot).

* It is by giving gifts (to the priests) that the members of the third caste attain heaven (iii. 150. 51). Now it is said: 'a man of the people-caste that gives a part of his harvest to the priests after he has taken out the sixth part (for taxes) is released from sin' (xiii. 112. 19: *ṣaḍbhāgapariçuddhaṁ ca kṛṣer bhāgam upārjitam, vaiçyo dadad dvijātibhyaḥ pāpebhyaḥ parimucyate*).

† A king that takes 'even a fourth' is not guilty of wrong 'in a time of distress' (M. x. 118ff.); but the legal tax from the people-caste is one sixth or one eighth on grain, one twentieth on gold and cattle, or only

All these taxes, it will be noticed, are drawn from the third estate or people-caste, which (including the degraded) appears in Megasthenes as in native works more properly a heterogeneous order, without likeness of parts, than one united caste-body. All these, however, poor or rich, must pay taxes. Not so with the soldiers. The latter are practically exempt from taxation; the priests (unless degraded) are so by divine law. It remained for the farmers and their kind to pay. The freedom from taxation of the military caste is negatively implied by two facts—first, that servants of the king are not taxed, and all in military service were called the royal servants (*bhṛtya*, soldiers); second, that the soldiers were not 'protected,' but did protect, and therefore it would be clearly against the theory of taxation as barter to demand tax of the military caste. Only the people-caste are meant as tax-payers; and Megasthenes also implies that none of the military paid taxes. We must of course ex-

---

one twelfth on grain and one fiftieth on gold, while in smaller industries (profits from trees, meat, honey, flowers, skins, pottery, etc.) one sixth only is known to the code of Manu. See my note on M. vii. 130. In a fable of the Epic, Manu himself comes to earth and draws a tax on grain of only one tenth, on gold and cattle of one fiftieth, according to xii. 67. 17 ff. The grain-tax is not on the value of the whole property, but on the gain (contra my note). Gāutama's law allows a tax of a tenth, an eighth, or a sixth (G. x. 24. 25); and the last is usually recognized by all law books as the right (grain) tax (Vās. i. 42, *rājā tu dharmeṇā 'nuçāsat ṣaṣṭhaṁ dhanasya hared anyatra brāhmaṇāt.* So Bāudh. i. 10. 18. 1). The Rāmāyaṇa, too, has verses to the same effect: 'A king may take one sixth, provided he protects' (R. iii. 10. 12–16). The expression 'gold' includes all mercantile transactions, according to some commentators. Gāutama says that one twentieth is the duty (*çulka*, as distinguished from *bali*, tax) on all merchandise, but makes that on flowers, fruit, etc., one sixth (or sixtieth?). Compare M. viii. 398, and the statement, ib. 402, that market prices are adjusted every five days or half month. The ten per cent. duty appears to be especially for imported goods, a sample being also taken (B. i. 10. 18. 14, with Bühler's note). The day laborers, not in royal service, pay for tax one day's labor a month on public works (G. x. 31; M. vii. 137–138), while artisans pay some trifle in the same way (Vās. xix. 28: *pratimāsam udvāhakaraṁ tv āgamayet*). This labor-pay was termed *viṣṭi*, a sort of *corvée*, a tax in toil. The Sanskrit word means the laborer forced to give his work, or the work itself. The formal eight factors of the king's war resources include such labor: chariots, elephants, horse, foot, *viṣṭi*, ships, spies, guides (xii. 59. 41; 76. 5; 121. 44 ff.). Thus the native authorities on taxes. Law and Epic repudiate the idea of one fourth being a proper or customary tax. Yet even royal monopolies are recognized, and the minutiæ of taxation laid down in these law-books. What inference may we draw? That the 'extremity tax' allowed in time of dire need had in the Greek's day become the regular tax? This, unless we assume that the rate of taxation decreased instead of increased. But see Burnell to M. vii. 130. It would seem, then, that Megasthenes postdates even the original didactic part of the Epic. His famous account of the soldiers' deference to the farmers, like the farmers' indifference to the soldiers in Alexander's battles, may be true, but the Epic custom is to destroy the enemy's land and crops (see below). The *na sasyaghātaḥ* rule (xii. 103. 40) does not refer to the foe's land.

cept those of this caste that had given up the profession of arms and become practically farmers. These were taxed as such. Of the people-caste, the wealthy members were of course most heavily taxed; but, more content with inference, the didactic part of the Epic says: 'Those that make wealth should be taxed: tillers of the soil, raisers of cattle, traders; for a wealthy man is the crown of creation.'[*]

Certain practices and prerogatives of the king increased his treasury, in part at new expense to the people-caste. For if any man of this caste was not an orthodox believer, his goods might be confiscated for the purpose of paying therewith for the cost of a sacrifice—that is, his cattle might be given to the priests: 'Whatever shall be necessary for the sacrifice the king shall take from the possessions of a wealthy man of the people, if the latter be irreligious.' The king owned, of course, all the wealth of his family. That of his younger brothers became in reality his own. Thus the king offers 'all his own and all his brother's wealth,' without question of that brother's desire.[†] The Dasyu (un-Aryan) population was also liable to have its goods confiscated, if the king needed them.[‡] A legal prerogative of the king is the possession of property found without owner: bearing on all castes, of course, but particularly on the wealthy. Any property found abandoned is taken in charge by government officials and guarded for the owner during a year; it is then confiscated. All property found goes into the royal treasury, after a fourth has been presented to the finder. But all treasure-trove goes to the king,[§] or the king and the priests. I have noted no rule to this effect in the Epic.

If we turn back to the earliest Vedic period, we find that the tribute paid to the king seems to have been but a voluntary offering; in the latest, it was required. The Brāhmaṇa-literature appears to show the people-caste as a class existing mainly for the purpose of being levied upon and 'devoured.'[‖] A small poll-tax, symbolized as a love-offering, may have been customary besides the tax on produce, as a survival of the original free *bali* or offering, or may well have been a later natural addition to the regular tax, without thought of the antiquity of the custom. At any rate, the 'love-tax' is common in the Epic, and was given by everybody, including those not liable to taxation—priests, etc. 'For love's sake (*prītyartham*), the priests, the warriors, the men of the people, the slaves, the barbarians, all the folk, high and low, brought tribute to the king.'* So thoroughly, however, has the man of the people become identified with the 'man that pays taxes,' that the latter has become in the Epic a standing epithet or even a synonym of the former.† This expression is applied also to subject princes, not to native members of the warrior-caste, and means in such circumstances tribute-giver.‡ Rather a remarkable case of a forced levy on such subject princes occurs in the third book: remarkable, because such princes have usually a certain war-tribute to pay, while here they are obliged to submit to an extraordinary demand in time of peace. The heir to the throne of Hastina (practically the king) desires to raise a sudden sum of which his treasury is incapable. His ministers advise him thus: 'Let these protectors of earth that pay tribute to thee furnish thee with the (necessary) tributes and the gold.' This was done, apparently; for the building and sacrifice that the king wished to complete are carried on without further difficulty.§

---

[*] xii. 88. 26; M. x. 115. Certain persons were always exempt from taxation (*akaraḥ*): priests, children, women, royal officers, and various afflicted persons. Compare v. 33. 93 ff.; M. vii. 133; viii. 394; Vās. xix. 23 (*rājapumān*); i. 43; Āp. ii. 10. 26. 10, ff.; G. x. 11.

[†] *Yan mamā'sti dhanaṁ kiṁcid Arjunasya ca veçmani*; xv. 12. 11.

[‡] xii. 136. 1–11; 165. 5–7; M. xi. 11; G. xviii. 24 ff. Gautama permits such confiscation also to defray wedding expenses, and from those that have shown themselves irreligious (that is, from such of the people-caste, as the context shows).

[§] Vās. xvi. 19; B. i. 10. 18. 16; G. x. 38. 42; M. viii. 38. According to some, only a sixth is deducted for the finder. Priests may, however, keep all they find (Vās. iii. 13–14; G. x. 45).

[‖] Compare Zimmer, *Alt. Leben*, p. 166 (Ait. Br. vii. 29), who quotes apropos Tac. Germ. § 15.

Taxes were, then, levied by force, if occasion required, or stood at a nominally fixed rate of a sixth from the annual gain in crops, or a fiftieth in the case of cattle and on invested moneys: rates subject to variation and subsequently increased;

---

* ii. 52. 37–39. The extravagance of the description somewhat impairs the value of the citation. The context mentions gold jars, hundreds of maidens, etc., etc., as being received by the king on this occasion. He was about to become emperor.

† *vāiçyāḥ . . karapradāḥ*, ii. 47. 28. Compare below i. 192. 15. The 'lord of earth' always means a warrior (king); the man of the people is called 'a tax-giver' (*karadaḥ*).

‡ The conquests of war always result in large caravans of tribute returning to the conqueror's city with him. Such tribute consisted of horses, sandalwood, aloes, rare cloth, skins, gems, pearls, blankets, gold, silver, coral, etc. Horses, particularly northern and western horses, are greatly prized. Compare ii. 30. 28, and 27. 27, 28. 6: 'Eight parrot-colored horses, and others of a peacock color from the North and West countries.' These were taken by Arjuna 'as tribute' (*karārtham*).

§ iii. 255. 16: *ya ime pṛthivīpālāḥ karadās tava, te karān saṁprayacchantu suvarṇaṁ ca.* Compare iv. 18. 26 (Yudhishthira's) *balibhṛtaḥ pṛthivīpālāḥ,* or subjected and tributary princes (and viii. 8. 20). This is the old word for tribute of conquered peoples; compare RV. vii. 6. 5. But it is used also of the third-caste tax-payers (xii. 88. 26: a passage strongly condemning those officers that exact unjust taxes; when discovered, they should be supplanted, and made to pay up what they have stolen).

and the people brought voluntary offerings in addition to those required.*

These irregular allusions to taxes are truly the main points wherein the two great supporting castes touch each other in our Epic, and but little remains to indicate the formerly proud condition of the herdsman; for, as Pūshan, the Vedic god of the cattle-dealers, was fabled to have lost his teeth and been obliged to live on mush, so the power of his pet caste had decayed. I have elsewhere† sought to show that in late legal literature there is a distinct separation of the third caste from the other two, and a tendency almost to put the people on a par with the slave; and this is seen in the Epic: not alone in such allusions as simply indicate that the people were regarded mainly as a tax-paying machine, but in forms of expression like, for example, 'The warriors were like the people, waiting upon the twice-born and bringing gems' (ii. 49. 35); or in such facts as this: that the term applied to represent the relation of the third caste to both the military and priestly presents the idea of distinct subordination.‡ Also, when the castes are grouped, as in describing a procession, the natural arrangement seems to be not to put the three Aryan castes against the slave-caste, but to unite the slave-caste and people-caste as one group over against the warrior- and priestly-castes as another distinct group.§ Also, in this connection, the wording of God in the Great Song (Bhagavad-Gītā) is significant: 'Whoever they be that seek their rest in Me, even they that are of low worth, even women, men of the people-caste, and slaves—even these find bliss.'‖ Also the fact that a difference is made between the rights of the people and warriors in the matter of fasting may be mentioned, couched in these words: 'Fasting three nights or two nights is enjoined only for priests and warriors; but if men of the people-caste and slaves should institute such a fast through delusion of mind, they would get no reward for it.'* The favors granted to the people-caste are the same as to the slaves; the only difference being in the form of words expressing this. 'To the people-caste the king should give protection; to the slave-caste, non-injury.'† In all these cases, late as they are, we see the reflex of an unacknowledged process of amalgamation between the people-caste and the un-Aryan population. This process has two phases. First, the inevitable tendency of the third estate to take up with new work, needful and profitable, but not sanctioned by usage; this was a natural drifting away from the Aryan aristocrats. Second, the long-continued and ever-increasing binding together of the warrior- and priestly-castes, practically leading to an exclusion of the third estate from the inner and intenser Arya-hood of the two more powerful orders. The people-caste was partially seduced and partially pushed out of the national ring. They stood on the edge between good blood and barbarous. As was likely to be the case, the caste that patronized them most and flattered them with sweet words was the priestly. Such proverbs as they have left show us, however, that all regard for the caste was based on an appreciation of the bakshish they could give. 'He is blessed with fulfilment of all his desires who gives a night's rest to a man of the people' (iii. 200. 122) is a remark polite enough to make us think this man a person of importance; but when a reason for honoring him is vouchsafed, it is merely that he has wealth. A poor man of the people was of no consequence. In fact, he is in such circumstances advised to become a slave at once (M. x. 98; but in V. P. iii. 8 he is told to adopt the warrior's life). How nearly on a social par with the slave the man of the people stood is well shown by the frightened exclamation of King Drupada when he finds his daughter gone: 'What,' he exclaims, 'my daughter gone? Oh, whither? Who has taken her away? Is it possible that any base-born slave or tax-paying man of the people has carried her off? Is it possible that the muddy foot (of such a man) has been placed on my head, and that this wreath of flowers (my daughter) has been cast upon a graveyard (that wretch)?' (i. 192. 15). It is only in its sustaining or 'supporting' power that the people-caste finds a begrudged honor; for in this regard the royal power and the power of the farmers is declared to be equal.[*]

---

* The knightly rule of not asking for a gift (iii. 154. 10: *nā 'haṁ yācitum utsahe, na hi yācanti rājāna eṣa dharmaḥ sanātanaḥ:* cf. xii. 88. 16; R. ii. 95. 19), arising from the priestly privilege of begging being confined to that caste, so as to exclude the members of all other castes from the three peculiar privileges sacred to the priest (making sacrifice for others, teaching, receiving gifts: e. g. M. x. 77), seems to have had an effect on the attitude of the king toward the tax-payers. The king ought to demand his taxes, not ask for them; and they must be paid, not as a gift, but as if it were a pleasure to pay; it being for the people's interest to be taxed. This attitude, however, is not constant.

† Relation of the Four Castes in Manu.

‡ *Upasthā*, compare iii. 4. 15: *vaiçyā ivā 'smān upatiṣṭhantu.*

§ Compare i. 126. 13–14; 164. 20, and the grouping in xiv. 89. 26; 'Next to the priests came the warriors; then too the people- and slave-crowds, and then the barbarous races (*tathā viṭçūdrasaṅghāç ca tathā 'nye mlecchajātayaḥ*).

‖ vi. 33. 32. Compare the like words employed of the division of the castes in the second great song (*Anugītā*), where it is said: 'Abiding by this law whatever evil-born people there be, women, men of the people-caste, and slaves—even these find bliss; how much more the priests and the warriors!' xiv. 19. 61.

---

* xiii. 106. 12ff. The two latter castes may have a *caturthabhaktakṣapaṇa* but not a *trirātra*-fast.

† i. 85. 3ff. Compare also: 'Priests are pleased with bounty; warriors, with a good fight; the people-caste, with protection; women, with love; the slave-caste, with mercy; common people (*pṛthagjana*), with bounty's leavings' (xiv. 90. 13).

A further point of contact between the third and second castes remains to be considered: namely, the military obligations of the third caste. Was the people-caste liable to military duty? Of course, as a general thing, no. The soldiering was done by the standing army and mercenary troops. But men of the people-caste did serve in the army, although Megasthenes says they did not. What else is meant when all the law-books say that men of the priestly and the people-caste may take up arms 'to prevent a mixture of caste'? This is emphatically decried as a custom for priests, because 'the duties of a warrior are too cruel for a priest':[†] but as an occasional necessity the two unmilitary castes must have served. Antecedently it would seem unnecessary to prove this. In view, however, of Megasthenes' picture of the farmer, it may be well to point out what is said by native authorities.[‡] The Epic has the same formal rule as the law-books: 'To save a cow, to save a priest, or when the castes become confounded, there let the man of the people take arms—and to protect himself.'[§] But in the battle-scenes we find a curious dictum, to the effect that 'it is a holy and heavenly thing to knights men of the people, and slaves to fight in battle'; which takes the presence of these men in battle as a matter of course.[‖] They were there to make part of the resisting mass, but not to be individually marked as fighters, like the warriors. See the battle-descriptions below, and the difference between the mass of the army and the individual heroes. It is stated in one passage that the people-men, slaves, and mixed castes took the side of Karṇa in battle (viii. 87. 48); but the context will not allow us to assume that they were in the fight. The half 'people' origin of Droṇa, one of the great generals of the Kurus, as well as that of Yuyutsu, shows, however, that people-caste-blood was no bar to fighting. As to the priests, see below. It may be parenthetically observed that the great army chosen by Duryodhana (instead of Krishna) consisted only of cow-herds;

---

[*] Compare iii. 150. 30 ff., on *vārtā*.

[†] 'A priest's defense is wrath, he does not fight with weapons,' it is said (iii. 200. 78).

[‡] The legal maxims are given Vās. iii. 24–25: *ātmatrāṇe varṇasaṁvarge brāhmaṇavāiçyān çastram ādadīyātām*; G. vii. 25; B. ii. 2. 4. 18. Compare Āp. i. 10. 29. 6, and G. vii. 6 (spurious, according to Bühler: cf. B., loc. cit., 17).

[§] xii. 165. 33. The next verse gives an interesting variant on M. xi. 147 (supporting Medh.): 'Drinking *surā*, killing a priest, adultery with the *guru's* wife, they consider inexpiable; death is the penalty' (so Nīl.).

[‖] viii. 47. 18: observe the adjective *vīra*: *kṣatraviṭçūdravīrāḥ*.

but this is a particular Krishnite case, depending on the conception of that deity as himself a cowherd (v. 7. 17 ff.)

Official relations between king and people-caste are rarely alluded to. We have seen that in the defense of the realm men of the people might be selected as vicegerents for the king, as well as members of the upper castes. We have once also a distinct distribution of subordinate officers, who are to be selected partly from the people-caste: 'The king shall appoint,' says this rule of the pseudo-Epic, 'certain officers of the realm: four of these shall be priests; eight shall be of the warrior-caste; twenty-one should be selected from the people-caste. These last must be wealthy.' There are added to these three members of the slave-caste, who must be modest and of pure character. This would lead us to suppose that the ministers or officers here intended (*amātyāḥ*) are for small offices; although the further addition of the king's charioteer on the list implies that some may be of importance, as this was one of the highest military offices. We are not informed as to the duties of the others mentioned, and the men of the people may be no more than the public servants (*bhṛtyāḥ*) who are elsewhere entrusted with superintendence over different affairs of state, and in the developed realm are overseers of mines, guardians of arsenals, etc., and are chosen from all castes, their positions being adjusted simply by their natural endowments and in accordance with the strict rule that their appointments shall not be 'against the caste order': that is, that an under-officer shall not be of higher caste than his superior.* We may remind ourselves here of that case (spoken of by Lassen) of people-authority surviving by legend in the person of Yuyutsu, son of the king of Hastinapura by a girl of the people-caste, but always treated as an equal and a warrior, and finally entrusted with high authority as minister, and a member of the royal council of the Pāndus. Such authority reflected again in Droṇa, and more strongly in the case of the minister Vidura, son of a slave-woman, points to a period of looser caste-distinction as that wherein the Epic originated.†

---

* xii. 85. 6–9; 118. 1–120, 52 (in 119. 6: *pratilomaṁ na bhṛtyāḥ sthāpyāḥ*). The commentator on the first passage takes *pañcāçadvarṣavayasam* as applying to each *amātya;* but it really applies only to the charioteer of fifty years of age.

† In diesem Sohne des Dhṛtarāshtra's und seinem Bruder Vidura scheint sich in der Sage die Erinnerung an eine frühere Zeit erhalten zu haben, in welcher die Vaiçya (the people-caste) weniger scharf von den Kriegern gesondert waren als später: Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 784 (Yuyutsu, see P. W.; and add xii. 45. 10; xiii. 168. 10; 169. 11, etc). The same author further notes that in Java the Vāiçyas as state-officials and councillors still bear the name of *gusti* (*goṣṭhi*), as of 'cattle-tending' origin; whereas in Bali only trade and finer artizanship became their regular occupation. In Java the slave (*çūdra*) disappears; in Bali he

Having thus surveyed the general state, and sought to explain how it happened that 'the people,' originally all, gradually shrank socially, became a caste, and then again, by approaching to the lower orders and by absorbing lower trades, expanded; while, ever larger than the military or priestly class, this order, in reaching beyond the occupations ascribed to it, now began to be synonymous with all the folk not embraced by the priestly order, the standing army, the slaves, and such lowly members of the body politic as were still too plebeian to be encroached upon—I turn directly to the warrior-caste, the status of which in many points has already been indicated in this examination of the people-caste. But first a closing

---

is still the unhappy un-Aryan native: Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* iv. 518–522. R. Frederich (On the Island of Bali, J. R. A. S., N. S., ix. 108) says, however, that the *gusti* may be king. He also notes that in Bali the warrior is called *deva*, divus. Some wider notices of points touched on above may here be in order. The Epic (iii. 190. 86) and the Vāyu Purāṇa make what is to us an explained distinction between *pura* and *pattana* (*pura*, *ghoṣa*, *grāma*, and *pattana*, Vāyu P. ii. 32. 40). The Ag. P., while with the Bhāg. P. (see P. W.) mentioning the *kharvaṭa* (above, p. 22) as provided with an outlying circuit of common land equal to half that of a city, elsewhere (213. 9) knows only the Epic municipal divisions of *grāma*, *pura*, and *kheṭaka*; or *nagara*, *grāma*, *kheṭa* (ib. 93. 33); varying with *durga* for *kheṭa* (ib. 105. 1; rules for protecting and furnishing these outposts in ib. 221). This Purāṇa also gives the rules for establishing boundaries, and the fines for transgressing them (256), and the decimal system of governors (222. 1 ff. taxes, deposits, thieves). The Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Up. recognizes a system of governors over villages: iv. 3. 37. It is here also that we find the admission that 'none is greater than the warrior, and the priest under the warrior worships at the ceremony called *rājasūya*, since the warrior alone gives (the priest) glory' (ib. i. 4). The distinction between townspeople and countrymen (p. 72: add xv. 8. 13), and the narrowing of the term 'people.' is reflected in late literature, as in the Varāha P., where traders stand opposed on the one hand to townspeople in general, and on the other to the 'people-caste' (*vāiçyāḥ*, Var. P. 122. 64). To quotations on the color of the castes we may add ib. 75. 15 (the Northern Kurus, ib. 75. 58); and Vāyu P. i. 26. 35 (34. 19), the warrior is 'red,' since he came from the third face of Brahmā. The *grāmavāsagrāsa* (hereditary claim to part of the produce of a village, discussed by Weber, Pañcadaṇḍ. p. 34, note 180) seems in the Epic entirely unknown. That the corporations or guilds (above, p. 24) are not solely guilds of priests is seen, apart from the definition of military and mercantile guilds mentioned above and by the commentators on M. viii. 41 (see Bühler's note), by comparing the definition of *çreṇi* by the commentator to Varāhamihira (vii. 10) as any 'body of men belonging to the same caste' (Kern, J. R. A. S., N. S., v. 46); while Nīl. on Mbh. xii. 36. 19 (*jātiçreṇyadhivāsānāṁ kuladharmāṅç ca sarvataḥ, varjayante ca ye dharmaṁ teṣāṁ dharmo na vidyate*) defines *jāti* as caste and *çreṇí* as *gṛhasthādīnām paṅktiḥ*, as if one of the orders in the divisions of any Aryan's life. The 'chief of a corporation' seems indicative of a wealthy man in the drama (Mṛcch. Act iii.). Zimmer, loc. cit. p. 159, gives the older clan divisions, the folk consisting of tribes, these of communities, these of families. The folk, in the Epic, presents itself rather in the newer antithesis, city versus country, but the village-life and family-factor are, in spite of the theme of the Epic being military, still prominent.

word in respect of this latter order. In stating that it began to expand again into the people at large, I have touched upon but one side of its degenerate development. We have seen the caste in its longitudinal divisions. Cattle-raising, crop-raising, money-raising formed, until we come to times farther back than the Epic, almost parallel lines of division.* But there is, on the other hand, a latitudinal division, one of absolute wealth irrespective of the business creating it, which appears to have arisen in the Epic period, and to have made almost as great a subdivision of the caste by plutocratic measure as was created by the three primitive coördinate qualitative divisions of labor.† In the early period the people-caste is, as a whole, in wretched plight. In the Epic a social distinction appears between the rich, whether farmer, ranchman, or trader, and the poor of the same caste. Only he that makes a corner in grain and obliges poor people to suffer is despised in spite of his wealth (see below, B. 3). With ease, comparative immunity from state-service, and golden opportunities, the enterprising members of the caste advanced beyond their fellows, accumulated wealth, made themselves felt as a power in the state, and gained straightway admission to the royal council again—as they had before been members of that council, ere the haughty knights crushed them socially downward. I do not mean that they ever regained the social equality they had lost. But they were *en route* to do so, as the Epic shows. There is a greater social difference between the wealthy farmer and his kind (of the same caste) than between that laborer and the farmer's slave, in all but religious privileges; a greater political difference than between the farmer and the poor warrior. 'Head man in a village,' says Zimmer, speaking of the Vedic man of the people, 'was the highest honor he could attain.' In the Epic he may (if wealthy) become a royal adviser, and manager of local concerns in town.‡

---

* *kṛsigorakṣyavāṇijyam iha lokasya jīvanam, karma çūdre kṛṣir vāiçye:* iii. 207. 24.

† 'Even wealthy slaves' are a sign of prosperity; not to speak of wealthy priests, warriors, and the 'people-herds' mentioned in the same list, xv. 26. 8 (*çūdrā vā 'pi kuṭumbinaḥ; vāiçyavargāḥ*). So in R. vi. 62. 40 we read that a Chaṇḍāla and a poor man are the same to the speaker (*dvāv eva sadṛçāu mama*).

‡ A late verse in the fifth book, given apparently for its reference to woman, seems possibly applicable in an older state of affairs than the part of the Epic in which it is imbedded can concern. It may be of general application only; but it is not improbable that it should once have referred to a king's division of authority among his family and officers. 'One should put the care of the inner-city (inner-house?) into the hands of his father; the charge of the cuisine (*mahānasa*) should be intrusted to his mother; a friend should attend to the cattle; the needs of merchants (guests) should be attended to by various dependents (or officers, *bhṛtyāḥ*); his sons should look after the priests (guests?); the man (king?) himself should devote himself to agriculture:' v. 38. 12 ff.

4802

The warriors, not nobles, but of poorer sort, those that had no wealth, whose position was that of common soldiers, are, as might be expected, almost as much ignored in the grandiloquent Epic as the poor trader or cow-herd. From the indications in the battle-scenes, rather than from formal statement, it seems probable that the king supported a large army of common men, inferior fighters, not much respected, who differed among themselves by virtue of their respective personal dexterity and ability in certain arts of war. Thus, the archers are sharply distinguished from the spearmen; the elephant-riders, from the horse-riders; but little more is to be seen of them. They were the common soldiers and nothing more. Some were native troops, and enjoyed Aryan privileges in religious rights and rites; but there seems to be no distinction between the legal or military rights of the native Aryan soldier and of the hired mercenary. The matter is more clouded from the fact that most of the common soldiers in the war are just these imported mercenary or allied foreign troops. A certain patronage of each great knight may be referable to the latter's rank as general; and I should hesitate to assume from the nearness of the knight to his particular body of men, or from their fidelity to him, that there was any patron-and-client-relation ship, or that any one of the great nobles stood nearer to one regiment than to another. Yet, as member of a clan, such must have been the case at first; and since we see that even in the Epic, just as in the Vedic period, the troops were arranged 'clan by clan,' or family by family, it is perhaps only reasonable to assume that the respective captains and other officers (*balamukhyāḥ*) were stationed at the head of their own family or clan men, in so far as these were separable from the like sort of fighters belonging to other clans. These soldiers when disabled were supported by the king. I group below the few general remarks concerning them to be found in the Epic (for their actual fighting life, see the next division of this paper). There is nothing whatever in the Epic to justify the statement of the law that a warrior lacking means to pursue his proper business should be taken care of by a priest; and, indeed, the law itself contradicts this, and advises the poor warrior to betake himself to farming (M. x. 83, 95; viii. 411). As the soldiers drew their pay from the king, and were cared for if disabled, there was no necessity for recourse to a priest. Out of the battles they appear so mixed up with the general populace that we can make nothing of their position. As Megasthenes says, they probably did nothing but amuse themselves when not in the field. Occasionally we catch a legendary glimpse of the process by which a poor soldier becomes one of the great nobles and founds a family. Karna was a cow-herd's son, but a good fighter, and the king liked him. He became a royal favorite. He even ventured to enter a knightly tournament; but an objection being made to this on the ground of his obscure origin, the king at once knighted him, so to speak, or really kinged him, making him 'king of Anga' on the spot, and triumphantly insisted that his new rank placed him on a level with kings, or with the best knights of his court (i. 136. 36). The cowherd's son became *rājā* of a dependent town, and was thus ennobled. Such a king (and many appear in the Epic) is of course merely a governor under royal orders.

The king's court was made up of native nobles,* royal allies, family connections, and subject kings. I shall add the priests. but with a restriction. They belong to his council, but seem a gradual intrusion on the knightly assembly (see below). These nobles, for the most part native and well-born, took part in council, conducted the assemblies, led the army, and were the king's vicegerents in all military affairs. Not a few of the highest knights were in reality conquered or allied kings. Some were the relatives of the king by marriage, drawn away from their home to new connections. Thus one of Dhritarāshtra's craftiest advisers was his wife's brother. So Krishna, a near relative of the Pāndus' wife, spent most of his time at the court of her spouses.† These nobles, knighted warriors, who had in the Epic account to prove themselves worthy of their rank on reaching the end of boyhood, and were recognized as knights only after giving an exhibition of their skill and prowess in a formal joust, made the real aristocracy of the land. Power they shared with the priests, and the latter received a formal precedence from their spiritual and intellectual superiority. But the court, with all its brilliant accompaniment of festival, show, hunting, dance, gambling, fighting, and general folly, consisted of and depended on these military nobles. They were alone the equals of the king in tastes and desires, and were socially his practical equals also, as many a scene will show. Or, if we wish didactic proof, it offers itself in the statement that there is a three-fold origin of kings according to the codes: namely, an aristocrat, a hero, and a commander of armies: which means historically that kings are made from these three kinds of men, or, as the use made of the quotation indicates, these three men rank as royal.

---

* There is a verse in the Rāmāyaṇa (I do not remember where, and cannot now find the place) that defines the *çūra*, or knight, as (I think) *pāuruṣeṇa hi yo yuktaḥ sa çūra iti saṁjñitaḥ*. That is, a man of might is the real knight. But *çūra* means more than this, and, associated as it almost always is with *satkulīna* 'well-born,' means a noble, technically speaking—a man of the upper class at court and in the field. *Kulaja* (well-born), as epithet of a warrior, is indicative of power, as in vii. 185. 29.

† One of the law-books says that a king is obliged to support all his chief wife's relations; Vās. xix. 31 ff.: *rājamahiṣyāḥ pitṛvyamātulān rājā bibhṛyāt tadbandhūṅç cā 'nyāṅç ca.*

But historically the remark is of greater interest. It shows what was probably true: that, in spite of the many boasts of hereditary crowns, the king is recognized as often chosen for his personal characteristics. In the case of the established kings it is a truism that 'their superiority consists in their valor' (*vīryaçreṣṭhāç ca rājānaḥ*, i. 136. 19). Family, personal bravery, and skill in leadership are, then, according to Epic rule and usage, the conditions under which the warriors become chiefs and are reckoned as on a par with kings. The words of Tacitus rush to our minds at once; indeed, the comparison is a most remarkable one. Let us put the two passages side by side. The Epic says that these three produce kings (or, as said above, according to the application, may rank as royal) —an aristocrat (*satkulīna*); a hero (*çūra*);[*] and he that leads forward an army (*yaç ca senām prakarṣati*). Tacitus says: "reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt . . et duces exemplo potius quam imperio, si prompti si conspicui si ante aciem agant admiratione praesunt."[†] With the appointment of every high official we are continually reminded that he must be of good family. Great wealth can ennoble a man of the people-caste somewhat; great bravery or skill can do the same for a warrior. But the descendant of a good family is qualified for high standing even if not remarkable for personal endowments.

The later Epic, and especially the Rāmāyaṇa, gives the impression that the ministers and all the councillors of the king are of the priestly caste.[‡] We often find 'councillor' and 'priest' as synonymous terms. At the great deliberation in Vālmīki's poem all the state affairs are in the priests' hands. It is a priestly council that decides the whole matter of succession, and whether it is best to crown the second prince. In fact, it is here the family-priest alone. So in reading the late advice ascribed to Kanika,* a figure that is interpolated and appears on the scene only to vanish forever, we are led to believe that important state matters are deliberated upon by the priests. This is a clouding of facts; and, in justice to the nobles of military caste, we must, before dismissing the subject of their social position, note that they are the real advisers of the king in all matters not purely judicial or spiritual. For the *mantrins*, or cabinet councillors, consist chiefly of these nobles. This term, like all others of the sort, is but half technical. It means councillor, and may apply to anyone acting in the capacity of adviser. It is, however, usually restricted to members of the royal council, and, though generally understood of priests, is not confined, even by the commentators, to such an interpretation. It may apply even to general officers, according to the native interpretation of the passage quoted above concerning the men of the people and others as officers (*amātyāḥ*); for here we are told that the king should also select eight councillors, and these are understood by the commentator to be an elect body of these *amātyas*, consisting of the charioteer, the three slaves, and the four priests; but this is very improbable. All the *sacivas* (comites) may be, and often are, purely military. These are officials of the highest rank, to whom in the king's absence, for instance, all the royal business is left (i. 49. 23). At times (although Manù recommends 'seven or eight *sacivas*') we find but one appointed, while the 'assembly men' (*pāriṣadāḥ*) guard the king's councils; but both of these ranks are really military.† When Yudhishthira leaves his capital with his brothers, the city remains in charge of the Purohita and Yuyutsu: a half spiritual, half military command (xv. 23. 15). In (i. 102. 1) another case it is Bhīshma alone who 'guarded the realm' in the minority of the king. Absence of defined titles and functions among the ministers makes it impossible to differentiate strictly the different values of these titles. The functions run into each other, and even the number of the bodies concerned is not given consistently. Thus, in another passage (xii. 80. 23 ff.; cf. 83. 2), a description of the *amātyas*‡ is given, of whom nine are here mentioned ('two or three men should not be appointed to [share] the same office'); and, again, members of the assembly and nine *mantrins*; while a little further on (83. 22) the *mantrasahāyāḥ*, who are surely the same, are spoken of as distinct from the *arthakāriṇaḥ* (cf. M. vii. 64), who are alone five in number, and have the same characteristics as the *mantrins* previously mentioned. The *sahāya* or 'helper' is a high minister (cf. xii. 57. 23 ff.). After quoting Manu twice (xii. 112. 17, 19) to the effect that power gives victory, and stating that an abiding realm must depend on a good helper, *sahāya*, the sage proceeds to describe an efficient *saciva* (compare M. vii. 54) with the words (ib. 118. 3 ff.): 'he must be of good family; skilful; know the use of spies; understand peace and war; know the threefold department of a king (*trivargavettā*); know how to make trenches, and conduct military movements (*khātakavyūhatattvajñaḥ*), and know the art of training elephants (*hastiçikṣā*, cf. *hastiçikṣikāḥ* in viii. 38. 16). The general minister meant here by *saciva* is, therefore, not of the priestly, but of the military caste. On the other hand, *bhṛtya* is anyone in the pay of the king, employed (*niyukta*) on any service, even to the keepers of the harem.*

---

[*] On the different kinds of *çūras*, in a religious sense, see xiii. 75. 22 ff. In vii. 163. 35, C. reads *yudhāḥ* for *çūrāḥ*.

[†] Tacitus, Germania, 7. Mbh. i. 136. 35 (*trividhā yonī rājñāṁ çāstraviniççaye*). The commander, or general in chief, usually stood in the van; the king, as in Sparta, usually remaining in the centre, though not always so. Compare below on the army; or, in general, e. g. xiii. 62. 85, on the commander's position: 'If heroes are slain leading in the van, they go to heaven.' In India the king is derived, for example, from 'one that leads forward an army,' or such a one is a princeps. In Germany *si ante aciem agat* corresponds exactly; but such a one is only a noble; the dux cannot become rex: 'their kings they choose from the aristocracy; their leaders in accordance with their bravery' (I cannot refer *et duces*, as some do, to the kings, 'the power of the kings is limited, and being leaders,' etc.).

[‡] Compare xv. 5. 20: *mantriṇaç cāi 'va kurvīthā dvijān.*

---

* i. 140. 2 ff. He is a 'councillor' (*mantrin*). Observe that the family-priest proper is not asked for his advice.

† M. vii. 54; Mbh. v. 38. 14–20. Yudhishthira's *sacivas* are pre-eminently his four brothers (xv. 9. 12)

‡ The *amātya* is properly a member of the household or relation. Such is the earlier meaning. The Epic speaks of *amātya* as a general officer or minister; but compare ib. 80. 23: *gṛhe vased amātyas te*, the chief-priest, teacher, or a friend.

But the high ministers of the king, those that led his councils, are ordinarily regarded in later times as priests. Not so earlier. In the Epic the royal relatives of the monarch take the part of ministers, and we find Bhīshma to be the minister of war; and Vidura (whose mother was a slave-woman) to be the minister to 'superintend the treasury, and see to the appointment of servants and make arrangements for provisions' (v. 148. 9–10); while in the final adjustment of the empire by Yudhishthira (xii. 41), the king's brothers and cousins are made generals, war-ministers, and councillors. The nobles, then, of the warrior-caste are the practical 'helpers' of the king, and take, so far as the Epic shows us, the chief part in public consultations; wherein the priests appear of little importance, and are far less the leaders of assemblies than in the Rāmāyaṇa. On the other hand, the priests recommend that the private councillors of the king be priests, and the word *mantrin* (councillor) seems gradually to have become an indication of priestly caste. Moreover, wherever a knowledge of old wisdom, custom, or law is required, there the priests appear as the king's representatives. The ministers (military or priestly) hold the power in the absence of the king, and, as a legend would indicate, even the queen's commands must first be endorsed by the ministers, if the king is away (iii. 60. 21–22). It is from the priests that the king appoints the officers of justice or judges (*dhārmikāḥ*).† He is further directed to put Pandits in charge of the treasury, but does not seem to do so in fact. Eunuchs for the harem, and 'cruel men for cruel acts' (executioners) are among the minor officers specified, and it is said in respect of all these people that the king should treat them with alternate repression and indulgence, that they may remain both humble and devoted (*nigraha*, *anugraha*, iii. 150. 44–48; *dhārmikān dharmakāryeṣu - - niyuñjīta*, etc.; *miçreṇa*, xii. 58. 22). Besides 'good family,' moral requisites are made of all high officers, and good morals their usual praise (xii. 57. 23 ff.). As in the law, a list of those not fit to be employed as councillors is given—women, fools, greedy men, and frivolous persons—and six 'doors of council-breaking' are enumerated: viz., drunkenness, sleep, indiscretion, changeableness, trust in bad ministers, or in ambassadors (v. 37.57; iii 150.44; v. 39. 37).

---

* Compare R. v. 70. 7: *yo hi bhṛtyo niyuktaḥ san bhartrā karmaṇi duṣkare kuryāt tadanurūpam*; and R. ii. 97. 20: *antaḥpuracarā bhṛtyāḥ*. In the army the mercenary troops are meant by this term.

† The legal expression *prāḍvivāka* (judge) belongs perhaps to the same period that furnishes us with an 'eight-fold' division of the war-forces

The high-born and rich, then, from the warrior-caste, formed (as we saw was the case among the farmers) an aristocracy apart from the poorer members of their own caste and those that could not boast so high a descent. Now these latter, formally and as far as caste went acknowledged as equals, were practically on a par with the caste below them. The regular means of livelihood for a poor warrior, as for a poor priest, was to join the working community. He might take up his caste duties again as soon as he was able to support himself by them. Since this was an exchange of caste admitted even by the strict law, we may well believe that it was common in the time of the freer Epic. Gautama says that in need 'the priest may bear arms; the warrior practice the profession of one of the people-caste.' Certain exceptions are, however, taken to a warrior's life when he becomes a man of the people; and, just as a priest in similar circumstances is forbidden to sell human beings (G. vii. 14), so the warrior, permitted to become a trader (G. vii. 26), may not practice usury, while others are forbidden to exact from him more than three per cent. interest (a month); but elsewhere he is permitted to lend money to barbarians and sinners at a good rate of interest.*

---

instead of the earlier four, and an exhaustive analysis of the constituents of the state, xii. 121. 46. *Dhārmikāḥ* seems to denote judges in R. vi. iii. 13, where these and the 'chief of the twice-born' walk in a procession. Usually the king himself is the judge, or he appoints *āptas*, i. e. simply fit persons.

* Compare the law in G. vii. 8–21; Vās. ii. 24. 40, 48; B. i. 5. 10. 25; M. viii. 142. Agriculture was also practiced by the priests, and a discussion on this point in Bāudhāyana shows that it was not unusual for them to do so; for though it is here stated that 'the Veda impedes agriculture and agriculture impedes the Veda,' yet permission to study and to farm is granted to those that are able to carry on both pursuits: B. i. 5. 10. 28 ff. (in spite of 24); Bühler's translation above; compare M. x. 78–82, and Bühler's note to G. x. 5. I do not see how we can translate

Before passing to the chief exponent of the warrior-caste, the king, it may be well to see how much we may gather from the contemporary or earlier legal statutes that can help us to understand the general rules hedging all the members of this order. Such points as are here given belong more naturally to legal than to Epic literature, and we can draw no negative evidence from the silence of the latter upon them. On the contrary, the unanimity of the legal works in most of these particulars would point to their being of universal custom; and we may safely assume that, if not for the time of the imagined early beginning of the Epic, at least for the time when our Bhārata took its present legendary shape, such rules were generally recognized. From the Epic itself I first draw three rules for warrior-conduct: three fundamental rules, which are so often urged that they appear to constitute the Hindu warrior's private code toward his fellows. The first is the guest-law: every guest was inviolable. The second was the law of 'not forgetting a kindness.' The third was the sacredness of a refugee, or of one that threw himself even in battle upon mercy.*

I turn now to the smaller matters of the warrior's life, the end of which must if possible come on the field of battle.†

This life is governed, nominally, by minute laws in many particulars. We see, however, that these laws do not (except in strictly religious matters) affect other than the priest to any great degree after the age of manhood is passed. We find the

---

(G. vii. 25) *prāṇasaṁçaye* both as 'if his life is threatened' (that is, in a momentary danger), and 'in times of distress' when understood, as it must be, in 26 (*rājanyo vaiçyakarma*). It means when in dire distress (*āpadi*) in both cases, and 25 seems to me no argument against *tadalābhe kṣatriyavṛttiḥ* in 6 (as Bühler says it is, p. lii, Introd.). Compare Çāṅkh. G. S. iv. 11. 15.

* For special fighting rules, see below. The prominence given to these rules of social morality does not imply that the ordinary rules may be disregarded by the warrior, but that these particular ones are specially urged, appealed to, enforced, as peculiarly characteristic of the warrior's code. A reference for each from the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa must suffice, among many similar cases. The first law (*ātithya*), that a guest must always be hospitably received, kindly treated, and sent away unharmed, holds good even in the case of an enemy: xii. 146. 5; R. ii. 105. 50. The second law, that to forget a kindness (*kṛtaghnaḥ*) is an inexpiable crime, is declared in xii. 172. 25; 173.20 ff.; 272. 11; R. iv. 34. 18. Theft, adultery, and suspicion of a friend are the three sins particularly reprehended in R. vi. 66. 26. The last law, of non-injury to a refugee or one that calls for mercy, is especially prominent in tales and teaching; to violate this is also an inexpiable crime: xii. 149. 19; R. v. 7. 33. Compare in the drama Candanaka's remarks on the subject, Mṛcch., Acts vi. and vii.

† For 'it is a sin for a soldier to die in bed' (see below). But if he dies at home, it is the rule that his body shall be carried out (*nirharaṇam*), removed in a wagon (*yāna*), and burned (*dāha*) on the pyre (*çmaçāna*) with proper purifications, just like the ceremony enjoined for members of other Aryan castes who die at home: xii. 298. 38.

rules reaching for the most part back of the Epic period, and may, as said above, regard them as current laws laid down especially for the warrior-caste.

Thus, we learn that the warrior's name should foreshadow his life, indicating power or safety. The young boy-warrior should be invested from the age of six to eleven, the proper time of year being the summer; but the initiation into the caste must take place by the twenty-second year, or the man becomes an outcast, and loses his privileges as a 'twice-born' member of society.*

To distinguish himself from men of other castes, the warrior wore a hemp thread, a girdle made of a bow string,† and a staff long enough to reach the forehead (while other castes had other limitations in respect of these things).‡

Ceremonial distinctions of address also helped to establish a social difference between the warrior and the other castes, but the chief outward distinction was naturally that of dress.§ While the man of the people-caste wears a cowhide or goatskin as an upper garment, the warrior wears one of deer skin, each of course representing the animals near to his caste—agricultural and hunting. The under garment of the warrior should be of flax. Whether he should wear both at once, and, if not, which alone, is a disputed question. The cloak when worn is dyed with madder.[*]

---

* M. ii. 31–49, 127, 155, for this and following. Compare Oldenberg, note on Çāṅkh. G. S. ii. 1. 1, for the mystical relation between the years eleven to twenty-two and the syllables in the warrior-metre (*triṣṭubh*). Initiation, Vās. xi. 44, 72; G. i. 13; summer, Āp. i. 1. 1. 18. The rule of Āçv. G. S. (i. 15. 7) regarding the use of even and odd syllables in the names of men and women respectively, being contradicted by Epic usage (Arjuna, Janaka, Damayantī), is unquotable. Compare the later names, such as Çaṅkhana, Susandhi: the first a grandson of Āuṅka (Vāyu P. ii. 26. 203, 209). The sons have sometimes the raised form of the mother's or father's name, as in Çākuntala, Vāirāṭa (so Gāutama and Vāsiṣṭha?), but this is usually a means of denoting the daughter, as in Drāupadī. For a very characteristic view compare Vāyu P. ii. 1. 5: 'the Manavaḥ are called Mānavaḥ when they are in the past.' A priest in the Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa has three dissyllabic and three trisyllabic wives (11. 138). The 'secret name' of the boy, known only to the parents and family priest, is alluded to B. Ā. Up. vi. 4. 26 (on marital intercourse).

† Manu, loc. cit.; Vās. xi. 59; '*muñja*-grass with pieces of iron' is enjoined by Āp. i. 1. 2. 35 (that is, the priest's sort, but with iron) as an alternative.

‡ It is not universally granted to the warrior to carry any kind of staff, although this is permitted by Āçv. G. S. i. 20. 1. Most of the law-books say it shall be of banyan or acacia wood. Compare Manu, loc. cit.; G. i. 23; Vās. xi. 53, 56. The height of the staffs of other castes varies relatively, the general rule being a higher staff for a higher caste; but Cāṅkh. G. S. (ii. 1. 21) reverses this rule.

§ The dress of Northerners in general reaches from the feet to the breast, according to the Bṛhat Saṁhitā, 58. 46. Un-Aryan natives of the fourth century appear not to have been so decently clad compare Fergusson's description of the Amarāvatī Tope, J. R. A. S., N. S., iii. 163. For royal robes, those of nobles, and knightly apparel, see below.

The proper salutation for a warrior to give is made by extending the arm out level with the breast.[†]

Of social usages, we note that a priest returned home from his studies may not eat in a warrior's house, nor is the warrior a guest of a priest in his own village; but when the warrior goes visiting elsewhere, it is considered right (a pre-Epic rule!) to roast an ox for him.[‡] The specially religious rules do not particularly concern us; but in the light of the days of mourning set apart for the king (see below) we may notice that the authorities differ in regard to the temporal impurity incurred by the death of a relative: the warrior being impure for twelve or eleven days according to some; fifteen, according to others.[§] Kings never become impure; nor do those warriors that die in battle, since practical reasons forbid it.[‖] The members of the warrior-caste are allowed two legal wives, though some permit an (illegal) connection with a slave woman, which by others is strictly forbidden. In no case may this marriage be made with holy texts. Bāudhāyana remarks that men of the people and warriors are 'not particular' about their wives, and so allows the warrior three.[¶] The warrior, rich or poor, stands by law so much above the man of the people and below the priest that his fines are arranged and crimes estimated by the caste of the offended party. Thus, his crime in theft is twice that of the man of the people, and only one half that of the priest; since the higher the caste the greater the sin.[**] The penalty for a crime against caste-order is as severe as law can make it, both for an offender of the low and for one of the high caste. These laws are chiefly concerned with the abuse of high-caste people by the lower castes. An instance will illustrate the point. If a man of the people-caste commit adultery with a woman of the warrior-caste, the punishment is as follows: the man is burned alive in a hot fire; the woman is stripped naked, smeared with butter, and driven about the town on a white donkey.[*] Other more revolting punishments follow, with like transgressions in other law-books. If a warrior kills a priest, he is killed, and his property confiscated.[†] If, however, members of the upper castes commit adultery with a woman of the slave-caste, their most severe punishment is banishment.[‡]

---

[*] Vās. xi. 62, 65; Āp. i. 1. 2. 40; i. 1. 3. 1, 9, 10; Pār. G. S. ii. 5. 20; Āçv. G. S. i. 19. 11. In like manner the earth on which the warrior's house is built is, if specified at all, to be reddish in color (ib. ii. 8. 7). And later we find that the diamonds of a priest, warrior, man of the people-caste, and slave (!) are respectively white, red, sisira-flower-color, and black: see Bṛhat Saṁhitā, 70. 96; 80. 11. The warrior's house should face the second quarter, east (ib. *vāsagṛhāṇi viprādīnām udagdigādyāni*). Also we find that the bathing clothes are arranged according to caste: Āg. P. 258. 56.

[†] Āp. i. 2. 5. 16 (*uraḥsamam prasārya*).

[‡] Āp. i. 6. 18. 9; Vās. iv. 8; M. iii. 110–111.

[§] M. v. 83; G. xiv. 2; Vās. iv. 27. Compare V. P. iii. 11.

[‖] M. v. 93–94; G. xiv. 45.

[¶] M. iii. 13, 14; Mbh. i. 73. 8 ff.; Bāudh. i. 8. 16. 3; 20. 14 (with B.'s note); Vās. i. 24 ff.; Āp. ii. 5. 12. 3; G. iv. 14–15. Pār. G. S. i. 4. 11. See discussion of the Epic rule in the chapter below on Women.

[**] M. viii. 337. Compare 375–376, 267; xi. 127; G. xxii. 14; Vās. xx. 31, for fines in adultery and abuse, and proportion to the crime of the priest. The fines in abuse vary with the caste's position.

Interesting is the fact, supported by two authorities, law and Epic, that the widows of soldiers dying on the field of battle should be given a pension.[§] The soldiers are, furthermore, to receive their pay by the month (?), and in advance.[‖]

We learn also from the Epic that a soldier captured alive becomes the servant of his captor: in the full rule, remaining a slave for one year, but not liable to compulsory fighting during that period. After the year is over, he is 'born again:' that is, he is set free. Such is the Epic rule, but the legal code does not say that such a slave should be freed. On the contrary, the latter knows him only as one among seven ordinary kinds of slaves.[¶]

---

[*] Vās. xxi. 3–4. The same rule holds if the case is that of a warrior and a woman of the priestly caste.

[†] B. i. 10. 18. 19; Āp. ii. 10. 27. 16, of a slave.

[‡] Āp. ii. 10. 27. 8, 17. Some of these rules, as of the time of initiation, are older than the Sūtra period; and this older Brahmanic literature occasionally touches points not always given in the law: as, for instance, the height of the grave-mound differing according to caste; the *upanayana* of the warrior coming in summer, while that of the people-caste comes in autumn; the former caste belong to Indra, the latter to Varuṇa, etc. These early rules are all collected by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, x. 7 ff., 14, 20 ff.

[§] *kaç cid dārān manuṣyāṇāṁ tavā 'rthe mṛtyum īyuṣāṁ vyasanaṁ cā 'bhyupetānām bibharṣi*, ii. 5. 54: cf. xii. 86. 24. So Vās. xix. 20: *avyarthāḥ striyaḥ syuḥ*. Compare the same rule, A. P. 224. 25.

[‖] Both statements belong to the middle period of the Epic: ii. 5. 59. Compare below the second part of this paper.

[¶] The simplest form of the Epic rule implies the law, and reads: 'If one warrior conquers another in battle and gets him into his power and then lets him go free, he becomes to that man a 'revered person' (*guru*): that is, the freed captive must look upon him as a priest or father, and never refuse to offer him homage; the relation of 'father' on the one side implying 'slave' on the other (such is the application made in the text, ii. 38. 7). Compare R. ii. 74. 33: *yo me 'dya syāt pitā bandhur yasya dāso 'smi*). The fuller rule is given in xii. 96. 4, thus interpreted (and rightly) by the commentator: the captor should instruct his captive to say 'I am thy slave'; whether the captive consents to say this or not, the captor should, after the expiration of a year, acknowledge him to be 'a son': that is, let him go free. This rule is based on practice. So Jayadratha as captive is to be made a slave until released, iii. 272. 11. Compare iv. 33. 59, where one is obliged to repeat 'I am a slave' in order to live. It is probably an extension of this rule that makes it incumbent on captive kings to declare by

An important question arises, in reviewing these rules, in regard to the time that the ordinary warrior had to devote to his religious studies (obligatory on the twice-born), and the age at which he usually assumed arms.

Of students of the Vedas in general, from seven and a half to thirteen, eighteen, twenty-four, thirty-six, forty-eight, or even more years are demanded, till their study be perfected.*

In accordance with a practice assumed to be consonant with the spirit of such a law, we find, to take one case of many, that the Pāndus are represented as 'having studied all the Vedas and the various treatises' (on duty, etc.).† It is evident that such a rule could have obtained in its strictness only among priestly students; and we shall be antecedently disposed to think that the students of warrior- and people-caste were permitted to give up study under easier conditions, as they were easily freed from penances obligatory on priests.‡ Their lives made it necessary to allow them more freedom. Studying, sacrificing, and giving are sometimes declared to be their 'three occupations:' that is, the three common to all the twice-born;§ and such study might make them masters of the Vedas sufficiently to be able to teach, even the priest becoming their pupil in time of need: that is, when the student of the priestly caste can get no priest to instruct him (Āp. ii. 2. 4. 25); but as a positive injunction the memorizing of the three Vedas is found only as a command laid upon the king, not upon all members of his caste

---

signs that they are beasts of various sorts. Compare the interesting account in Bṛhannārad. P. viii. 35, where the routed Yavanas in their fear 'ate grass or leaped into the water' (*tṛṇāny abhakṣayan*). So perhaps Nebuchadnezzar 'ate grass,' i. e. was conquered. The regular 'seven slaves' are, according to M. viii. 415, a man made captive of war, a man that earns his food by serving, a (slave) born in the house, a man purchased, a man given, a man (formerly a paternal slave and) inherited, a man made a slave as fine (debt). The native commentator will not admit here that a member of the warrior-caste may be enslaved (absurd, in the face of the Epic), and refers the 'man' to a member of the slave-caste. But the rule is evidently general, in spite of verse 412. A later code allows slaving 'in caste order:' that is, permits priests to enslave warriors, and warriors to enslave men of the people (Yājñ. ii. 183). Universal rule permits a priest to enslave any loose member of the slave-caste (M. viii. 413, etc.). Pār. G. S. iii. 7 gives a curious rite for charming a slave so that he shall not run away.

* M. iii. 1.; B. i. 2. 3. 1 ff. (more than forty-eight years, if the Atharva-Veda be included); Āp. i. 1. 2. 12 ff.; Āçv. G. S. i. 22. 3, etc.

† i. 1. 124 (122), *te 'dhītya nikhilān vedān çāstrāṇi vividhāni ca.*

‡ G. ix. 1, Bühler's note.

§ Vās. ii. 15: Āp. ii. 5. 10. 6. These stand in contradistinction to the three peculiar to the priest, teaching, making sacrifices for others, and receiving gifts; which three, with the 'six immunities' of the priest (immunity from corporal punishment, imprisonment, fines, exile, reviling, and expulsion, G. viii. 13), constitute the practical difference in the lives of the two upper castes. To the 'three occupations' of the warrior comes also 'protection' as his peculiar duty.

(G. xi. 3; M. vii. 43). Now how is it in the Epic story? We find in the great war that a number of very young knights were engaged in battle; that Arjuna's son, Abhimanyu, who was but sixteen years old (i. 67. 118), had already married, and was looked upon as a fully equipped knight. We see that the Pāndus and Kurus themselves in the early part of the tale were trained, not in the holy writings, but in the 'Veda of the bow;' and when a preceptor was sought for them, he was desired 'to teach them skill,' not Veda; and the result of these instructions in 'bow and arms of all sorts' was that the young Kurus and Pāndus 'soon became expert in every weapon.'* We have in the Rāmāyaṇa also a proof that the sixteenth year† was the end of boyhood, and that the young warrior was ordinarily proficient in arms by that time. For when the chief hero of this poem is about to be taken away from home, his father exclaims 'he is as yet but a boy (*bāla*); he is not yet sixteen, and has not acquired the use of arms:' a passage showing clearly that the age of sixteen was the terminus of boyhood, and that a young man (*yuvan*) of that age was expected to be ready for war.‡ How are we to interpret this? The science of arms required years of patient study. Is it conceivable that a boy otherwise occupied in physical training should by the age of sixteen be master of the special skill that gave him power on the battlefield, and at the same time have found time to commit to memory even one Vedic collection? It is clear that the law is later than the Epic on this point; and even there such knowledge is only to be assumed as desirable for the warrior in general. The active young knight and busy trader must have performed their duties toward the Veda in a very perfunctory way, if at all. The more reasonable supposition seems to me to be that, while in the early age there was no let to the desire of a young warrior if he wished to be Veda-learned, the conventional practices of his caste nevertheless constrained most of his attention to arms, and in his eight months of schooling (if even this, the later term of yearly study, be allowed for so early a time) he probably did nothing more than 'go over' the text of the Veda.* The memorizing of even one Vedic collection it is absurd to believe could have been attempted by such young warriors as those the Epic depicts. The practice must have been peculiar to the man of leisure, the priest. Indeed, it is not to this caste as a whole that the Epic ascribes such knowledge; but the king alone is, theoretically, acquainted with the three-fold Veda. A sort of commutation of learning seems to be implied in the Sūtra period; for we read that the student, instead of learning all, may even as an alternative to the *anuvāka* (itself a concession) recite only 'as much as the Guru thinks best;' or 'only the first and last hymn of each seer;' or 'at the beginning of each hymn just one verse.'†

---

* In the long story of the Pāndus' boyhood, we find the youths half grown up and in need of a teacher. The Kurus too were idle and wicked, and it was necessary to set them to study. So Gāutama and Droṇa became their instructors. The reputation of each was based on his superiority in handling weapons. It was for this reason that, 'desiring a Guru to teach the boys skill' (*guruṁ çikṣārtham anviṣya*, i. 129. 42), Gāutama was appointed; and Droṇa's efforts as a teacher were wholly directed to this aim; for 'he taught them the Veda of the bow' (*çikṣayāmāsa ca droṇo dhanurvedam*) and treatises, so that they became 'skilled in weapons' (*sarvaçastraviçāradāḥ*: i. 130. 21 ff., 29–30). This also is the meaning of the hendyadis in the short story of the Pāndus, where the boys begin to learn arms and 'not long after became learned in the Veda and bow' (*na cirād eva vidvāṅso vede dhanuṣi cā 'bhavan*: i. 61. 6).

† This is usually the age when the *godāna* ceremony (giving the family cut to the hair) was performed: compare e. g. Āçv. G. S. i. 18. 2.

‡ *ūnaṣoḍacavarṣo 'yam akṛtāstraç ca me sutaḥ*: R. i. 23. 2; iii. 42. 23. Compare for sixteen as the general time of boyhood's ending (always thus by formal law) Mbh. xiv. 56. 22. The boy becomes legally responsible for his acts with his twelfth year: i. 108. 14.

But if we examine closely the education of the royal princes, we shall be tempted to doubt if even royal personages learned much more than the art of arms, and the general 'Veda-of-the-bow.' The seer, for example, who quizzes a king on the state of his kingdom and his ability, asks whether that king possesses the Veda and its priest, wives and their fruit, money and its fruit, revelation and its fruit; and, when the puzzled king asks what that means, explains that the Veda and fruit thereof means sacrifice. But when the same seer really wishes to know what the king has studied, he asks him whether he comprehends the 'aphorisms on horses, on elephants, and on chariots;' the only Veda here mentioned being the 'Veda-of-the-bow.' The subjects assumed as real objects of royal study are these aphorisms, with further collections of the same sort in regard to poison, city-life, and military machines; for these, with the knowledge of magical weapons and sorcery, constitute the practical erudition of the king.* With such subjects as these alone, at any rate, the royal personages seem familiar; and even Yudhishthira, a lay-figure upon which didactic rags are exhibited, appears less a sage than an ignoramus in regard to all he ought to have known had he studied as formally assumed.†

---

* One more quotation would indicate the age of sixteen as the normal age for boys to be knighted and allowed to enter the battle-field. Droṇa, just before his death, is described as raging about the battle-field eighty-five years old, 'yet acting in battle as if he were but sixteen' (*raṇe paryacarad droṇo vṛddhaḥ ṣoḍaçavarṣavat:* vii. 192. 65; 193. 43).

† Çāṅkh. ii. 7. 22 ff. The twenty-second verse alone would give any liberty of shortening (*yāvad vā gurur manyeta*). Oldenberg, translating this, notes the consequence, and calls the plan an 'abridged method, by which students who had not the intention of becoming Vedic scholars, and probably chiefly students of the Kshatriya and Vaiçya caste, could fulfil their duty of learning the Veda.' In xii. 132. 20 (21=M. viii. 44), we are told that the *dharmavid*, or king erudite in rules of duty, must know the 'four-fold system of right.' This is best explained by another verse in the same book (xii. 59. 33), where the three-fold (Veda) is one; logic, two; agricultural occupations (including trading, etc.), three; and the system of punishment, four (compare, to the first, the commentator, *trayī cā 'nvīkṣikī cāi 'va vārtā ca daṇḍanītiç ça*). The age of manhood is reached at sixteen. The statement in the Bṛhat Saṁhitā that a man does not reach his full weight and size till he is twenty-five proves nothing to the contrary (*puruṣaḥ khalu pañcaviñçatibhir abdāir arhati mānonmānam*, B. S. 68. 107), though it is rather surprising. In the Rāmāyaṇasāra the hero's age at marriage is fifteen; his bride's, six: compare Rājendralāla Mitra's Notices, No. 2288.

It is interesting to compare in detail the account given of young Abhimanyu, a model prince. We are told in a general way that the sons of the Pāndus 'went over the Veda, and acquired (the use of) the bow and arrow;' and that the family priest, Dhāumya, saw to the completion of the proper religious ceremonies connected with their birth, etc. Preceding this general statement, however, we have an exact list of the branches of study pursued by Abhimanyu (to the younger generation what his father Arjuna is to the older). 'The Veda-of-the-bow, in four divisions and ten branches,‡ he, the Veda-knower, learned complete from Arjuna, both the divine (weapons) and the human. Then Arjuna taught him the special points in the knowledge of different weapons, in dexterity of use, and in all arts; and both in science and practice made him equal unto himself; and he rejoiced as he beheld him.'

This is all the education that is especially recorded of Abhimanyu, except what Veda-study is generally implied in the following verse quoted above.§ The word Veda in the Epic is not strictly applied in any circumstances. The Mahābhārata itself is called the fifth Veda (i. 63. 89: compare v. 43. 41). With that of Abhimanyu we may compare the education recommended to the sons of kings in the thirteenth book: 'Knowledge, the family-laws, the Veda-of-the-bow, the Veda, elephant-riding, horseback-riding, chariot-driving, rules of propriety, word-science, music and the fine arts, legends and tales.' Compare also the education of Drupada's supposed son, who was taught 'drawing and other arts and the bow and arrow.'*

---

* *kaccit sūtrāṇi sarvāṇi gṛhṇāsi . . hastisūtrāçvasūtrāṇi rathasūtrāṇi . . ; kaccid abhyasyate samyag gṛhe te . . dhanurvedasya sūtraṁ yantrasūtraṁ ca nāgaram; kaccid astrāṇi sarvāṇi . . brahmadaṇḍaç ca viṣayogās tathā sarve viditāḥ:* ii. 5. 110, 120 ff.

† The assumption made in the second act of Utt. Rāmacar. that the studies in archery, etc., are completed by the age of ten, and the young prince is then invested and begins to study the Veda, is a complete inversion of the truth. Compare the also late version of a prince's education in A. P. 224. 1 ff.

‡ Therefore sometimes plural, as in a case apropos, where Daçaratha's sons are learned 'in the Vedas and their mysteries, and in the Vedas-of-the bow.' In this case Rāma and the rest do without doubt learn the Veda and take their task in studentship, according to the poet. They are *vedeṣu sarahasyeṣu dhanurvedeṣu pāragāḥ* and *caritabrahmacaryāḥ* (iii. 277. 4 ff.). Such *snātakāḥ* as these young princes may be the *vratasnātakāḥ* of Pār. G. S. ii. 5. 34: that is, an admitted class of students whose vow ends before they accomplish their study; but the *snātaka* generally implies only a priest, as the rules for a *snātaka* show, by totally excluding other castes: compare Çāṅkh. G. S. iv. 11. 15, where *snātaka* must mean priest.

§ i. 221. 72 ff. and 88. In the words (72 ff.) *dhanurvedam arjunād veda vedajñaḥ*, only the Veda mentioned can be fairly understood, especially

One word on the warrior as a man, before we turn to the king. I do not know whether we may permit ourselves a judgment in respect of the estimated value of the warrior's life by referring to the compensation exacted from him that takes such a life; but it is worth recording that, according to formal law, restitution should be made to the amount of a thousand cows (and a bull) if one kill a member of the warrior-caste. Comparing this with the valuation set on the life of a man of the

---

as Arjuna of course is not represented as an instructor in spiritual knowledge (*kriyāḥ* means military arts; so *āgame ca prayoge ca*, current information and practice, with the commentator).

* xiii. 104. 125, 146 ff.; v. 189. 1 ff. Compare with the last R. i. 80. 27 ff. After *dhanurvede ca vede ca nītiçāstreṣu*, and the art (*çikṣā*) of elephants and cars, we have *ālekhye, lekhye, laṅghane, plavane*; and 80. 4, *lekhyasaṁkhyāvid* (cf. R. ii. 2. 6) with *gandharvavidyā, nyāya, nītiçāstrāṇi*, etc. The mass of received literature which a sage may know often groups Vedas, rules, and legends with many other rubrics; but it is impossible to assert to what time these lists belong, and they are consequently of little value for the early usage. As an example, we find in ii. 11. 25 the *āyurvedo 'ṣṭāṅgo* (*dehavān*, followed by, 32 ff.) the *ṛgvedaḥ, sāmavedaḥ, yajurvedaḥ, atharvavedaḥ; sarvaçāstrāṇi, itihāsāḥ, upavedāḥ, vedāṅgāni, vāṇī saptavidhā, sāmāni, stutiçāstrāṇi* (?), *gāthā vividhāḥ, bhāṣyāṇi tarkayuktāni, nāṭakāḥ, kāvyāḥ, kathākhyāyikā* (*kārikāḥ*)—that is, even a kind of dramatic literature and commentaries. The *kathāḥ* are either *kathā divyāḥ* (xv. 29. 14 etc.) or of war (see below). The passage quoted from the thirteenth book enjoins *çabdaçāstram* and *kalāḥ* along with *yuktiçāstram* (grammar, the fine arts, and etiquette), and so represents perhaps a later list than that from the second book: both, however, showing that the line of education was away from the Veda, and that what time the princes had was given to culture, not to religion. I take it that, as the old royal personal fighting days ended—that is, as the princes were more and more expected to be figure-heads in war, and drove into battle to watch it on an elephant's back rather than to lead it in a war-car—their older bow- and sword-training was given up; but the time so gained was spent in more effeminate, certainly not more dryly intellectual occupations. Perhaps the rather late Virāṭa, with the cowardly little crown-prince, shows us the step between. As to the order of the Vedas, we find generally that the Atharvan stands last; but compare xii. 342.8: *ṛgvede sayajurvede tathāi 'vā 'tharvasāmasu*; and xiii. 17. 91–92: *atharvaçīrṣaḥ sāmāsya ṛksahasrāmitekṣaṇaḥ, yajuḥpādabhujo guhyaḥ* (compare xii. 343. 99-100, *pañcakalpam atharvāṇaṁ kṛtyābhiḥ paribṛṅhitam, kalpayanti hi mām viprā atharvāṇavidaḥ*; and xiii. 14. 309, *atharvāḥ*). The five Vedas are jingled together in v. 43. 41 ff., 52 (*yo veda vedān na sa veda vedyam*, etc.). The Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa is mentioned by name only in xii. (343. 13 etc.).

people by the same norm, we find that the relative worth of the latter was one tenth that of the warrior, one hundred cows here sufficing. This law is, as Bühler has pointed out, particularly interesting from a pan-Aryan point of view; for the receivers of the indemnity are left doubtful. Only one of the law-books (Bāudhāyana) specifies to whom the cattle are to be paid, and this work says that the restitution shall be made to the king. With this the native commentators are not in accord, and nothing in Hindu law demands such an interpretation. The priestly commentators modestly propose by preference that the kine should be paid to the priests; but Govinda, one of them, sanctions what must be the right opinion: namely, that the cows shall be paid to the relations of the murdered man.*

## B. Royalty.

1. *The King.*—We get no clear picture of the life of the warrior in peace till we come to the king. Here we are first burdened with a superfluity of epigram and formal advice. Out of this mass and the history of the story we may get a fair picture of the early Aryan monarch †

As a matter of course, the king is presented, when moral teaching is inculcated in the Epic, with a model little different from that extractable from any other didactic code. It is of passing interest to compare the personality thus predicated for 'a good king' with what we actually find, but the comparison must be drawn from but a fragment of the rich supply of injunctions found in the Epic.

Take the 'fatherly love' alluded to above: there is not a case recorded of the real characters of the Epic where a king exhibits aught but selfish greed, passionate weakness, and regardless fulfilment of his own desires. Not only with the Kurus, who are represented as naturally sinful, but with the so-called pure Pāndus, each follows the desires of the moment, and only religious interpolations soften the characters. It is too much to expect that such chiefs as these concerned themselves much with the lives of their subjects. The latter were 'protected,' because the former were always fighting and winning battles, while the tale of Nandinī, and other distorted echoes, show in legend the real and overbearing insolence of the kings toward their subjects, even those of priestly caste. But in theory the king must be the embodiment not of protection alone, but of love and care as well. And analogous to the old-time punning derivation of *putra* (son) from the *put*-hell and the idea of saving (*trā*), whereby the son is a 'saver from hell,' we find that the 'warrior' (*kṣatriya*) is derived from two components meaning 'he saves from destruction,'* through being a very storm-god to the foes of the kingdom,† as opposed to the universal benevolence of the priest. It is from this reason that the Epic dares to forge from Manu the bold statement that a king is equal to ten wise priests (i. 41. 27–31), a statement as un-Manu-like in tone as possible. The weighty reason given for a desirable perfection in the character of the king is that the realm will be like him: as is the king, so is his people.‡ This theory is carried out in the discussion more than once opened as to whether, of the four ages known to man, the particular age in which a king lives excuse his character, or the king himself be responsible for his age; since, if he is sinful, comes the 'dark age'; if good, the 'white and perfect age' is man's.§ These 'ages' are brought about by the king's personal conduct and his restraint of vice among his subjects, for he is like the Restrainer, the god of punishment,‖ in giving force to the laws of morality. Indicative of the whole tone of Hindu life is the fact that these 'royal laws' set for a king are an application of the earliest extant formulated laws: the royal laws (*rāja-dharma*) being in no sense *leges regiæ* (for we have scarcely an instance of a general law formulated by the kingly power), but simply laws made by the hardening of usage into rigid rule, extending very gradually from simple moral saws to rules of conduct, and thence slowly broadening, till the term includes social laws, and laws of administration. When a guide is sought, the sayings of the sage forefather Manu are quoted, who gradually became invested with a law-book that superseded the perhaps older treatise of the united sages Brihaspati and Uçanas, the first that appear to have devoted themselves particularly to the royal needs.[*] We must therefore deny the truth of the Epic assertion that the royal laws antedate all other regulations of Hindu law.[†]

---

* B. i. 10. 19. 1 (paid to the king); Āp. i. 9. 24. 1 (Bühler's note here suggests the right interpretation); M. xi. 128 (latest form, the case restricted to accidental death at the hands of a priest). Compare Tacitus, Germania, 21: "Luitur homicidium certo armentorum ac pecorum numero, recipitque satisfactionem universa domus." (Since this writing, Roth has shown the earliest form of such atonement in Vedic allusions, Z. D. M. G. xli. 672).

† *Rājan* (nom. *rājā*, rex); sometimes *rājaputra* is the equivalent of *rājan*. The latter appears often in composition as *rāja*; less often (generally as divinities), as *rāj*: e. g. *pretarājaḥ*, passim; *pretarāj*, viii. 14. 17. Other titles are chiefly poetical (see above, p. 21 note); but the common (*viçpatiḥ*) *viçāmpatiḥ* 'lord of the people' keeps the lost sense of people (for those that are governed), not that of people-caste.

---

* *kṣatād yo vāi trāyatī 'ti sa tasmāt kṣatriyaḥ smṛtaḥ*, xii. 29. 138; 59. 126; cf. v. 132. 31; though elsewhere interpreted as 'the destroyer'! The same derivation is found in B. Ā. Up. v. 13. 4: the warrior (*kṣatriya*) is life; life saves (*trāyate*) from hurt (*kṣaṇitoḥ*), etc.

† *āindro rājanya ucyate . . pariniṣṭhitakāryaḥ tu nṛpatiḥ paripālanāt*, xii. 60. 20; *āindro dharmaḥ kṣatriyāṇām brāhmaṇānām athā 'gnikaḥ*, xii. 141. 64: compare ib. 60. 12, *māitro brāhmaṇa ucyate*, and often.

‡ *yādṛço rājā tādṛço janaḥ*, xi. 8.32.

§ On the king's connection with the ages, cf. xii. 91. 6, and v. 132.12 ff.: 'The king is fitted for godhead or for hell according as he practices virtue or vice; . . the king makes the age; . . his reward is heaven if he gives man the perfect *kṛta*-age; if he gives the evil *kali*-age, he goes to hell for a thousand years.' An incorporation of two bad ages at once is found in xv. 31. 10: 'know that Duryodhana is the *kali*-age, Çakuni is the *dvāpara*-age:' that is to say, Çakuni is not quite so sinful as Duryodhana.

‖ *yamayann asato yamaḥ*, xii. 139. 103 ff., 5 (with likeness to other gods).

These 'laws' may be divided into two classes, embracing first general moral and social duties, and secondly special duties involved in the royal 'objects of consideration.' I examine each briefly. And first the tiresome rules of morality.

2. *Royal Duties.*—How completely the savage old kings of the first poem have become demoralized into priestly subjects is seen by a glance at the first of these classes. Victory is now a question of right and wrong: 'where right is, there is victory';[‡] an idea to be later extended on the theological side, and to give us 'where Vishnu is, there is victory' (see below); and paralleled by the repinings of the victorious king, who says that even the perusal of the treatises on knowledge (*buddhiçāstra*) is of little moment when one comes to die; but 'let a man be purified in heart, let his folks and ministers reverence his acts, and he is a king, the best of kings'; for 'it is better for a man that he even kill an Aryan than that he rule by overstepping the right' (xii. 25. 6 ff. [on *kāla*], and iii. 34. 15). The king's aim should be to seek first his realm's happiness, and then his own (i. 222. 12, etc.). Compare with this the remark addressed to a king: 'the tears of them that weep for thy wrong-ruling shall slay thee and thy herds; . . but where the tear of misery is turned into joy, there is a king's duty nobly done.' But to seek the happiness of the state he must first learn to control himself, 'he must overcome love and wrath and subdue his passions' (v. 129. 33–39). This the real kings of the Epic never did. It is, however, in accordance with such general admonitions that we find the duties soon specialized, classified, and arranged in groups. 'Eight virtues

---

[*] *bṛhaspatyuçanaḥproktāir nayāir dhāryanti mānavāḥ*: iii. 150. 29.

[†] 'The royal laws were first-produced by God; after these the subsidiary duties of the other castes; all laws depend on the royal laws:' xii. 64. 21; 64. 7; 61. 1; 'all duties exist through the royal laws': and, just before this, 'depend on the royal laws.'

[‡] *yato dharmas tato jayaḥ*, xi. 14. 9. cf. 12. But, in i. 136. 19, 'right follows after power'! (*balaṁ dharmo 'nuvartate*). In xii. 199. 70, the version is *yato dharmas tataḥ satyam*, etc. Compare with the following, Vāyu P. ii. 30. 80: *rajir yatas tato dharmo yato dharmas tato jayaḥ*.

cause a man to shine: wisdom, good family, self-restraint, knowledge of revelation, courage, not talking too much, generosity, thankfulness'; though in the same passage we learn that 'when a king does good to a man, this virtue outshines all virtues'[*] (v. 35. 52; 37. 32 ff.). On the whole, we find the groups of eight commandments more common, but ten commandments are also made to form a concise exposition of moral law. 'The eight-fold path of duty' has become proverbial,[†] but varies often: consisting, for instance, of the above, or of sacrifice, generosity, study, penance, self-restraint, truth, uprightness, harmlessness; and variating (in place of the last two) with 'mercy, and lack of greed.'[‡] An imprecation in a later book on those that have 'broken the ten commandments,' without specifying them, would indicate that the ten had become also a formal group, as in Manu.[§] In answer to perpetual questions in regard to duty, Mārkaṇḍeya says to the king: 'Be merciful, be kind, be fond, be not sulky, be truthful, mild, generous, glad to protect the people; do right, avoid wrong; worship the fathers and the gods; practice all this in deed, in thought, and in word' (iii. 191. 23 ff.). The contrast between such a rule and this, for example: 'Just this alone is a king's duty—to bear a rod, to be fierce, to protect' (i. 11. 17), forms one of the questions most vexing to the sages. Pages might be taken from the harping on this theme alone: what proportion exists between a righteous wrath and kingly mercy?[‖] This and the constant injunctions of purity[¶] form the staple of these moral commonplaces. One example may suffice: 'Through right the king rules; through this he keeps his subjects in order; by means of right he beholds all, when he is furnished with spies.[*] The king is the savior of the castes; by witchcraft and wrong king's duties are destroyed; let the king dispense right through no love or hate; he should not be too devoted to a friend, nor too severe to a foe; he should not harm right; he should not return evil for evil,' etc. etc.[†] But, of all that a king should not do (for negative and positive are always treated in the same category), general consent has selected four sins, common to man but particularly reprehensible in a king: these, according to the usual formula, are 'women, dice, hunting, and drinking.'[‡]

---

[*] xii. 91. 6 ff., ib. 20: cf. 38; finally the usual comparison with Yama, 44, 56; a summary of morals in 52-53. Compare xii. 361. 9: 'the king that does not wipe away the tears of the conquered is as sinful as the slayer of a priest.' Compare also ii. 5. 124.

[†] *mārgo dharmasyā 'ṣṭavidhaḥ*: v. 35. 54, 56.

[‡] ib.; the ten in 59.

[§] *daçadharmagatāḥ*; the king may confiscate their property; xii. 69. 26: cf. 59. 59-60; M. vii. 47–50; the lists may be modified by Buddhistic influence. Both 'the ten' and 'the eight' are known to the Purāṇas, e. g. in Vāyu P. i. 59. 48.

[‖] cf. i. 3. 176: to protect is a king's 'highest duty'; but no absolute 'highest duty' is given. In iii. 150. 37 it is protection; in ii. 22: 5 it is to do good; in iii. 183. 16 ff. it is penance; in iii. 4. 7 it is contentment, etc. Whatever-duty fills the mind is for the moment paramount. Even 'the realm' is the 'chief duty,' iii. 52. 15; cf. v. 34. 29–31. Most wearisome are the droning iterations in regard to protection, whereby the poet means not from outside foes alone but from the king's own greed; and it is even recommended that the king should not set his heart on property gained by a foe's downfall, *arer pratipātena*, v. (39. 77, *praṇi*), C. 1522. The idea of 'word, thought, and deed' is sometimes extended: 'in four ways, by eye, mind, voice, and deed, let a king delight his people;' v. 34. 25: cf. iii. 50, 9; 157. 18; 41. 20; he must be a father to his people: iii. 23. 7; i. 121. 15; 100. 18; xii. 57. 33; xiii. 61. 18; he is the warrior's Guru: i. 195. 12.

[¶] iii. 119. 8; let him be pure; as in xii. 58 and 59, the formal duties are preceded by a recommendation of purity.

The only part of this formal morality that can particularly interest us is the vices it represents. Didactic strictures, form and contents, are foregone conclusions, given civilization and love for platitudes. These truths of social intercourse were almost as trite in the didactic Epic as they are to-day to us. A man should not lie, steal, murder, drink, gamble, be incontinent in passion, in sleep, in food, or in other provocatives to low living. Especially a king, since he is the norm of morals. All this is dull repetition; for when we once find out on what intellectual level we are standing, we can foretell the complementary verses as soon as the poetic sermon begins. But how is it in the real Epic? Let us look to the vices as portrayed, and come nearer to life.

---

[*] 'Spies are a king's eyes': v. 34. 34 (see below).

[†] iii. 207. 26 ff. Right (*dharma*) is now synonomous with law, now with duty.

[‡] iii. 13. 7; refers particularly to the warrior-caste: cf. M. vii. 50; this is also shown by 'they say that kings have these four vices, hunting, drink, dice, over-indulgence in sensuality (*grāmye, strībhoge*, N.), ii. 68. 20: cf. xii. 59. 60, the Manu verse. This is the antiquer form, but is kept till the latest time (cf. xiii. 157. 33), although parallel stands a fuller list, 'women, dice, hunting, drinking, brutality in voice or deed, and wanton destruction of property' (v. 33. 91); and elsewhere the 'six sins' are alluded to (i. 49. 16, *ṣaḍvargajin mahābuddhiḥ*: compare ii. 5. 125, *ṣaḍanarthāḥ*) as an understood group; but four is the more popular division, so again xii. 289. 26; and even five are given (in the metaphysical section, xii. 302. 55–56) as a group of inborn vices, desire, wrath, fear, sleep, *çvāsa* ('breathing' B. R.; or gluttony). The Rāmāyaṇa gives 'twelve faults'; seven vices, of which 'four are from love,' as in Manu. Compare R. ii. 109. 66; iii. 13. 3 ff. The instability of the group's members is greater than its number; for the division into four often remains with different definitions, as 'four let a king avoid, council with fools, pokes, wrathful men, and pilgrims' (v. 33. 69, 'and pilgrims', *cāraṇaiç ca*; or *ca-araṇaiç ca*; or *açanaiḥ*; while for *rabhasaiḥ* read *alaçaiḥ*, N.). Ignorance, as 'something childish,' is of course everywhere reprehended; what the king had to learn has been discussed above; *pāugaṇḍa*, xii. 90. 29, is the name given to kingly ignorance. The whole of this section treats of *dharma* (15 = M. viii. 16). Such lists are also Puranic in tone. Compare the *ṣāḍguṇya*, Ag. P. 233. 17; the *ṣaḍvarga* (vices), ib. 237. 7; the *saptāñgaṁ rājyam*, ib. 238. 1; and *aṣṭavarga* (duties), ib. 45; the *vyasanāni* of kings, ib. 240. 26 ff. In general these Puranic lists are taken from the earlier literature, however, and offer no occasion for remark.

If it be true that vices most rebuked by a people's law are vices most loved by that people, then women and drink were the chief stumbling-blocks of the Hindus.* As the king was allowed a harem unlimited in extent, I need only say that it is well-nigh impossible to disentangle new and old in the Epic material on the royal privileges and deprivations in this particular. As illegitimate children were regarded as a matter of course, and even the priestly saints, as legends tell, were prone to seduce blameless girls, the restrictions of the law may be held to be mainly for practical purposes. Mixture of caste was regarded as an evil. Too great carelessness with women would result in the evil. Therefore it is best not to indulge in sensual pleasures of this kind indiscriminately. Moreover, is it injurious. But every town has its hall for the dancing-girls (*nartanāgāra*), and they and the music-girls of the gaming hall are chiefly prostitutes; though the palace girls are said to 'dance by day and go home at night.' Women are provided for noble and royal guests when they come to spend the night, and are even furnished to the priests. The number of wives a knight had depended on his means. Purity was recommended to students of the Veda and the great ascetics. The military caste was not corrupt, or, perhaps, especially given to sensuality; but it knew nothing of the practice of chastity, except as a student's discipline. Occasionally a member of a royal house is represented as becoming an ascetic in this particular, but he is a wonder to all men.†

---

* Strabo says that Megasthenes reports frugality, honesty, and temperance among the Hindus, but he seems to recognize their common custom of drinking. In the same fragment he denies to the Hindu written laws and employment of witnesses (Fr. xv).

† The dancing hall (iv. 22. 16) is here a part of the king's house, but a separate building. Prostitution was a respectable profession, and, if hereditary, blameless; only men living on their wives' beauty or on their own were scorned. Idyls like the Nala-tale and Sāvitrī-story show us an ideal decency in men that reflects great art or a simplicity anterior to anything else preserved in the Epic. The Epic's chief and ideal hero was famous for his exploits and gallantry. Quite peculiar is the king in i. 44. 9, who 'having obtained a wife set not his heart on other women' (*tām prāpya nā 'nyanārīṣu mano dadhe*). The Epic heroes in general are not lewd at all, but natural; and no attempt is made to hide their amours and infidelities. One woman, who has committed adultery with her friend's husband, calmly remarks: 'In that your husband was chosen by you, he was thereby chosen by me; for legally a friend's husband is (the same as one's own) husband, my beauty' (*yadā tvayā vṛto bhartā vṛta eva tadā mayā, sakhībhartā hi dharmeṇa bhartā bhavati çobhane*: i. 83. 21). It is right to add, however, that her friend did not see the matter in that light. Purity is not a matter of principle, but of ascetic rule and statute law; intended to torment a man on the one hand, and to keep his hands off his neighbor's goods (women) on the other.

Hunting is reprehended in the same way that sensuality is. The law frowns on it, but it is one of the favorite amusements of the Epic kings and heroes. The later doctrine of non-cruelty to animals made the priests disparage the art, but it always flourished. Pāndu himself (the genuineness of the story is not important) is spoken of as a great hunter. We need not wait for the drama to show us the king with a large retinue rushing afield for sport with the deer. In fact, if we do wait, we find far less love of real hunting than in the Epic, though the dramatic heroes have a decently sporting-like spirit (compare the verses apropos in the second act of Çakuntalā; and in general from the dramatic period note that meat is given to a guest, Utt. Rāmacar. Act iv.; and hunting everywhere implied, though it is stated that the death of animals is not allowed in a good city, Mrcch. Act viii.). The priestly, perhaps Buddhistic, theory of protection to animals is not compatible with the real life of the Epic. 'As to the habit of killing animals, that custom is of course allowed by the custom of killing enemies' (i. 118. 12). The next verse declares that the slaughter of animals is a right of the king, supporting the statement by an allusion to Agastya (compare Ag. P. 240. 40). We find that after hunting they eat the carcass, as in the characteristic story of Dushyanta (i. 69. 21). A king 'firm in virtue and vowed to hunting' is elsewhere spoken of as possessing two good qualities.* The king usually hunts with a train: 'They all went out a-hunting in their chariots.'† But sometimes the king goes out alone with one horse.‡

Not only killing deer, but eating meat, later a sin, is commonly indulged in. One king sends as a present 'a great deal of meat' (*māṅsam bahu ca pāçavam*); and, at a certain wedding-feast, 'they killed all sorts of wild game and pure domestic animals, and brought (to the feast) a quantity of intoxicating liquor.'§

---

* i. 63. 1: *rājā dharmanityaḥ . . babhūva, mṛgayāṁ gantuṁ sadā dhṛtavrataḥ.* Dushyanta kills tigers with a sword (above). The hunt is usually for deer; but in Varāha P. vi. 21 a king goes out with a train 'to kill tigers especially' (*çvāpadāni*). Lion-hunting with dogs, attested by Aelian and Strabo (cf. Ktesias, I. S, Ind. Ant. X) is indicated by Mbh. ii. 40. 7, 'like dogs about a lion.'

† i. 132. 36–8: *rathāir viniryayuḥ sarve mṛgayām.* The 'fool dog' (*çvā . . . mūḍhaḥ*) appears here to have been an adventitious companion of the hunting party.

‡ When he usually meets a girl whom he seduces, persuading her that connubial union is best without religious rites. Compare i. 171. 21 ff. Other hunts are recorded in i. 221. 64 ff.; iii. 36. 45, etc. In the latter case the arrows are expressly stated to be free from poison.

§ iii. 75. 11, and iv. 72. 26–28 (*uccāvacān mṛgāñ jaghnur medhyāṅç ca çataçaḥ paçūn* (to eat, as context shows); also *surām āireyapānāni*). Village or domestic animals (opposed to the tiger etc. of the forest) are

I may add the exquisitely sober tale of the man who had to sell meat. There was a worthy man that had inherited a slaughter-house (*sūnā*) from his father. He was visited by a priest. The heir to butcherhood sat in the middle of the slaughter-house selling meat (venison, buffalo meat, and boar's meat), and there was such a crowd of buyers about him that the priest had to stand some time before he was seen. When gently reproved for engaging in such a sad business,* the worthy butcher earnestly replied: 'I do indeed sell meat, but I do not eat it, and do not kill the animals. This is my inherited occupation. Therefore it is right for me to practice it. In fact, if I did not, I should do wrong.' The tale well illustrates several phases of Hindu thought. The crowd buying of course bought to eat.†

Even a priest may be guilty of hunting, and presumably of eating animals, if I may quote another tale in the pseudo-Epic (xii. 168. 29 ff. to 172. 25), where we read of a 'priest of the middle district,' who went begging among the barbarians of the north country (*udīcyāṁ diçi mlecchesu*). He shortly became no better than a Dasyu (northern barbarian) or wild robber. But by and bye another priest came up to the same county, and found him armed with bow and arrows and covered with blood. Being heartily reproved for his bad ways, the first priest left and went to sea to make money by trading, since 'he was poor and did not know the Veda,' and had set his soul on making money. His course is not held up for our edification, however.‡

And so (with vices as with moral saws, to show not all cases, but examples) we come to the next great vice, drinking. We

---

the cow, goat, man, sheep, horse, ass, and mule (Vāyu P. i. 9. 42). *mṛga* is a generic term for game; thus the tiger is the king of *mṛgas*: e.g. A. P. 19. 27.

* The priestly law tries to impress the sin of eating meat by a pun—'*Me-eat* shall he in the next life whose *meat* I eat here' (Lanman to Manu v. 55: cf. Mbh. xiii. 116. 35; the same pun in *māṁ dhāsyati* = Māndhātā, iii. 126. 30). The Vāyu Purāṇa also gives the usual *māṅsasya māsṅatvaṁ*, ii. 26. 23.

† iii. 207. 10 ff. The Varāha P., relating also a funny story of Dharmavyādha, makes him appear very angry at the insinuation of his son-in-law's sister that he is a meat-eater. He says he does eat meat, but he kills only one animal (*paçu*) a day, and will not be called a *jīvahantar*, retorting: *pācayitvā svayaṁ cāi 'va kasmāt tvaṁ nā 'dya bhuñjase*: Var. P. viii. 25 and 28. In Mbh. iii. 208. 9 Rantideva kills a large number of cows every day to be eaten. See Indo-Aryans, i. 426, where this verse is quoted.

‡ Eating meat of kine is forbidden, but the earlier law allowed it. In the ceremony for the dead, *gavya* may be interpreted 'beef' in V. P. iii. 16. 1, but (comparing M.) is probably 'cow's milk' (compare Wilson's note). Vās. iv. 8: *brāhmaṇāya vā rājanyāya vā 'bhyāgatāya mahokṣāṇam . . pacet.* At the *madhuparka* ceremony meat is always allowed (Çānkh. G. S. ii. 16. 1, from Manu, as Vūs. iv. 5-6; M. v. 41).

need not go to the Harivança to find all the forbidden pleasures indulged in. Men and women drink freely, and only in didactic portions are such practices decried. They drank at the wedding mentioned above the worst sort of distilled liquors. There were many kinds of simple wines and distilled drinks, different for men and women, since the women prefer a sweeter sort than the men.* Intoxicating liquors were used on all festal occasions. A king gives a dinner to the priests, and many women come and eat and drink 'just as they like.' A grand festival is held, and men and women go out with dance and music and drink. The chief hero gets completely intoxicated (*kṣība*). Again, the royal family in another town make a great river picnic. Here also they have music of harp and flute and tambourine. They dance and they sing. The women grow very gay. They begin to get drunk. They 'reel from drunkenness;' they 'give away their jewels and their garments; play in the woods and run into the water; begin to laugh and sing and jeer and quarrel, and tell each other secrets.'† When a city is about to be besieged, no drinking and dancing is permitted; the dancing girls are turned out, and drink is forbidden.‡ Krishna and Arjuna both sit on their seats in an intoxicated state when they receive the Kurus' ambassador.§

Evidently the rule was first made for the priest, and then extended in the interest of morality to the other castes. There were always certain permitted intoxicating drinks, the number allowed increasing with the lateness of the time from which the law-book comes. In the Epic it is a newly promulgated divine law that 'from this time on a priest that drinks *surā* shall be considered blamable, just like a murderer of a priest.'‖

The next great sin of the Hindus (if, indeed, this be not a pan-Aryan vice) is gambling; and here we have not ignorance of forbidding rules on the part of the warrior, but direct contradiction offered by him to such rules.

---

* *kathaṁ hi pītvā mādhvīkam pītvā ca madhumādhavīm, lobhaṁ sāuvīrake kuryān nārī kā cid iti smaret*, iii. 278. 40 (cf. 39).

† i. 148.5 ff.; 219. 7; 222. 21 ff.; iv. 15. 7. Compare Indo-Aryans, loc. cit.

‡ iii. 15. 13. Impaling is the penalty for drinking or making *surā* against the law in xvi. 1. 31 (*yaç ca no viditaṁ kuryāt peyaṁ kaç cin naraḥ kva cit, jīvan sa çūlam ārohet svayaṁkṛtvā sa bāndhavaḥ*).

§ v. 59. 5: *ubhāu madhvāsavakṣībāu*. Compare for divine drunkenness v. 98.14: *bhavanam paçya vāruṇyaṁ yad etat sarvakāñcanam, yat prāpya suratām prāptāḥ surāḥ surapateḥ sakhe*: a vulgar pun on *suras*, gods, and *surā*, intoxicating liquor (comm. *vāruṇyaṁ vāruṇyāḥ surāyāḥ*).

‖ i. 76. 67: *yo brāhmaṇo 'dyaprabhṛtī 'ha kaç cin mohāt surām pāsyati mandabuddhir apetadharmā brahmahā cāi 'va sa syād . . garhitaḥ*. But the priests seem to be victims of vice till the latest time; 'gamblers and tipplers, usurers, singers, and traders' (*vāṇijaka*) are here (as in M. iii. 151 ff.) *apāṅkteya* priests (e. g. Vāyu P. ii. 21. 32 ff.). As usual, it is the city and court priests that seem chiefly to offend.

The game of dice was an old Vedic amusement, and we have in the Rig-Veda a 'gambler's lament,' and an allusion to the public gaming house.* That same gambling-hall that ruined him survived through all periods of the Hindu's growth. Tales are told, precepts are given, in vain. The sage points to the moral of history: 'kings have ruined themselves by gambling;' but the king-warrior triumphantly quotes 'usage' and silences the adviser. The law distinguishes between playing with animate and with inanimate things, showing that baiting and prize-fighting were common.† But the Epic confines 'playing' to two things, in hyperbole to war, and in matter of fact to gambling. The law yielded a point at last, and, after vain protests, we find in the legal enactments that dice-play is sanctioned, and the 'state gambling-hall' erected under police supervision, the revenue from it going into the royal treasury.‡ In the Epic, where the kings always play dice as a matter of course, the only crime in playing is cheating, or 'using magic.' In the didactic Epic alone is the game forbidden; but we are told that 'the bad kings (*kurājānaḥ*) of old always practiced woe-bringing gambling and deer-slaying' (v. 90. 56). The whole plot of the Epic turns on a game of dice. The king plays away all he has, wealth, crown, brothers, and self; then his wife. A nice point is here raised by the interested parties, as to whether he could rightly stake his wife, after he had himself become a slave by staking and losing himself, 'since slaves own nothing.' The legal light of the court declared that he could not; but it was generally conceded that the queen was thereby really lost, and became a slave. The only anger is caused by the discovery that all the game had been deceitful (see Sabhā). This same king, however, afterwards becomes a courtier at another's court, and assumes the rôle of a gambler by profession, 'in order to please the king and his ministers' by casting dice. 'I shall,' he says, 'become a dice-mad, play-loving courtier, and with the bejeweled holders fling out the charming beryl, gold, and ivory dice, dotted black and red.'* And so, in respect of this vice, we can say with Tacitus: aleam sobrii inter seria exercent, tanta lucrandi perdendive temeritate ut cum omnia defecerunt extremo ac novissimo iactu de libertate et de corpore contendant; victus voluntariam servitutem adit (Germ. 24).

---

* R. V. x. 34; A. V. vii. 50, 51; vii. 109. 1; Muir, Hymns from the Rig and Atharvan, J. R. A. S., N. S., ii. 31.

† Dice-playing is forbidden, M. iv. 74; a son is not liable for his dead father's gambling debts, ib. viii. 159: G. xii. 41; gambling with dice, prize-fighting, and drinking, are strictly forbidden, and sinners of this sort punished and banished, M. ix. 220–228 (late). *samāhūta* in the Epic is 'challenged to play dice,' ii. 48. 19: cf. 49. 39.

‡ The law-book of Āpastamba says that a table shall be set up in the assembly-hall, and respectable members of the three Aryan castes may meet there and play dice. They pay (according to the commentator) something to the keeper of the table, and he pays to the king a regular sum for the privilege of keeping the table. Nārada (Jolly, xvi.) shows a fuller development, and makes a different provision: as, for example, that the keeper gets ten per cent. on the money staked. The earlier text of Āp. reads: *sabhāyā madhye 'dhidevanam uddhṛtyā 'kṣān nivapet (nir-)*; *āryāḥ . . dīvitāraḥ syuḥ*, Āp. ii. 10. 25. 12 ff. It is added that the dice shall be of even number and of *vibhītaka*. In the later Nārada, the only sin thought of in connection with gaming is dishonest practice, e. g. using false dice, or playing in other places than at the royal tables, for the play was now a monopoly of the king. Compare Āçv. G. S. ii. 7. 10. The practice in Nārada agrees with the rule of A. P. 256. 49 ff. But there the *dhūrtakitava* gives up to the keeper of the hall five or ten per cent. of his winnings according to their amount. The game is a monopoly (ib. 47) of the king. Cheats are here branded and banished.

Four stages of development appear to have been passed through. In the first, gambling is generally practiced, and, casually, privately condemned when the result is bad. In the second, it is generally practiced, but the law begins to note its evils, and condemns it in mild admonitious language. In the third, it is generally practiced, but the law condemns it strongly, regards it as a state crime, and banishes the offenders. In the fourth, it is generally practiced, and the law takes it in charge, patronizes it, gives the king a revenue from it, and makes it a crime to play anywhere but where the king shall get his per cent. from the profits.†

'The king and the priest uphold the (moral) order in the world,' said the priest living before the Epic,‡ but the king enjoyed himself still, in spite of priest and law. The life of revelry indulged in by the warrior-caste, already indicated by the rules on drinking, dicing, and contests between animals, and shown by the law, is perhaps caricatured by the great carousal in the Harivança, but is testified to not only by Megasthenes,* but by the description in the Epic of all the paraphernalia of pastime at court. Majestic preparations! An amphitheatre for a joust at arms, moated and walled like a gated city;† a casino by the riverside‡ for the amusement of the princes; an amusement whenever any event offers an excuse;§ meat and wine at every festival; drunkenness, gambling, and love, the enjoyments of peace—what use to quote the sage's rule that a man shall not drink, shall not eat meat, shall not gamble, and shall be continent? Such rules were made by the priest, and for the priest; till a later age, influenced by modern feeling, extended them to the other castes, and interpolated them upon the early Epic.‖

---

* *sabhāstāro bhaviṣyāmi . . matākṣaḥ priyadevanaḥ . . vāidūryān kāñcanān dāntān phalāir jyotīrasāiḥ saha, kṛṣṇākṣāl lohitākṣāñç ca nirvartsyāmi manoramān.* The verb shows the casting out of the dice, and the commentator says the preposition 'with' refers to the means of casting, and defines *phalāḥ* as *çārīsthāpanārthāni koṣṭhayuktāni kāṣṭhādimayāni phalakāni*, seeming to have in mind hollowed vessels for rattling the dice. I am rather doubtful about construing *saha* as expressing *teṣāṁ* (*phalānām*) *nirvartanakaraṇam*, but cannot here translate *phala* as ('Auge auf sinem Würfel' (so B. R.), or take it alone as 'on the boards,' with *jyotis* as another kind of dice. The comm. would make the words for materials refer to color, blue, yellow, red, and white (resolving *jyotīrasāiḥ*) but I cannot follow him (iv. 1. 25). Simple dicing, not draughts on 'boards.' seems meant. The ordinary term for the dice-board is *āsphura*; for the bet made, *glaha*: ii. 56. 3–4. Nala as *akṣapriyaḥ* is to be compared with *dyūtapriyaḥ* (ii. 48. 19) of Yudhishthira, here called *priyadevanaḥ*, Comm. *krīḍāpriyaḥ*.

† The Rig Veda: Manu and the Epic sages: Mānavaçāstra, ix. 220 ff.: Āpastamba and Nārada—these illustrate the progression. The verse in Āpastamba must be later than the (spurious) passage in Manu, and is probably interpolated, as recognition of state gambling-tables postdates the Sūtra period. The Puranic use shows that gaming is assumed as common. Compare A. P. above, and 258. 79: *vyuṣṭāyām udite sūrye dyūte jayam avāpnuyāt*; and the quarrel over the game in V. P., v. 28.

† *dhṛtavratāu*, Çat. Br. v. 4. 4. 5 (compare G. viii. 1).

---

* πέμπτον (μέρος) ἐστὶ τὸ τῶν πολεμιστῶν οἷς τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον ἐν σχολῇ καὶ πότοις ὁ βίος ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ. διαιτωμένοις, etc.: Strabo, xv. p. 707.

† *prākāra, dvāra, toraṇa, parikhā*, i. 185. 17 ff. Compare the public games in V. P. v. 20.

‡ i. 128. 33, *udakakrīḍana.*

§ In i. 221. 69 the king makes an occasion of 'giving gifts' out of the fact that his brother has a son born.

‖ Outside the law, in all profane writings, rules restricting food and drink are found. Thus, as B. ii. 1. 1. 21 limits the use of intoxicating liquor for all twice-born castes, so does R. ii. 34. 27; 80. 4; iv. 16. 31 ff., v. 34. 10, for priest and warrior, limit eating, suppressing meat and *madhu* 'wine.' 'The king is lord of all but the priest' (G. xi. 1); and in this respect the latter enforced his rules gradually, so that it may be that the non-priestly castes were slowly led to temperance. Luxury is forbidden to the priest who is out in the world (ii. 21. 42), but the caste as a whole led an easy and comfortable life, and allusions are plenty to show how delicately cared for and fastidious the town-priests were (cf. e. g. iii. 92. 20). Even here we have no great asceticism as a rule. So, still more, a quasi-asceticism may be enjoined on the king and warrior; but I miss the sign of it in popular poetry, and distrust it in didactic epigrams. To speak the truth and not to steal seem to be in India the earliest moralities enjoined. Drinking and gambling and lust are frowned upon much later, and by priests. But in those first two, the 'moral sense' originated (not from the priests) from mutual advantages, and needs of social life; for until the most advanced moral code there is no thought of an abstract wrong in lying or stealing. Indeed, in the former case, certain occasions are mentioned where for utilitarian reasons lying is approved and commanded. For instance, one may lie to a woman at the time of marriage, or to escape pain or loss of one's property or loss of life. I confess I do not see the matter in the light in which Müller, 'India,' p. 34 ff., puts it (see ib. note D, p. 272, for citations). Such expressions as that of the V. P., 'the earth is upheld by truth' (iii. 12) have no great moral significance, weighed against the fact that truth to the Aryan Hindu warrior is a relative term; 'a lie is truth if it pays to lie' is the underlying basis of his morality in this regard. Compare viii. 69. 32: *bhavet satyam avaktavyaṁ vaktavyam anṛtam bhavet, yatrā 'nṛtam bhavet satyam*, etc.; 57, *yat syād ahiṅsāsaṁyuktaṁ sa dharma iti niçcayaḥ*; compare the

If we look at the legitimate amusements of the warrior-caste, we shall find very little but telling tales of war, song, dance, mime-acting, later the drama, and practice of arms in sport or in earnest.* Sometimes sport was combined with a serious intent, as in the tournament, where the valor of the princes is tested, and they through this test become enrolled as worthy members of the caste (i. 134 ff.). As boys, the princes' one amusement, outside of running, leaping, practice in arms, and rough horse-play with each other, seems to have consisted of a game played with a ball or hockey (*vīṭā*) which they roll or toss about.† The girls danced and played ball or doll (see Appendix). The sport of the cow-boys in the later times of the Krishna legends appears to have consisted in scandalizing and abusing the respectable inhabitants, and getting drunk, thus offering an interesting parallel to the life of our Western cow-boys.‡

3. *Royal Occupations.*—Alertness is perhaps the word best suited to describe the faculty prized in a king. 'He should be ready for the future, firm in the present, and understand what still remains (to be done) from the past.'§ Thus he will be able to protect his Aryan and un-Aryan subjects. Not to rob these, and to be brave and pure, defines his negative and positive duty toward his people.‖

---

whole section and ib. 70. 51 for cause. It was not Bhīshma's adherence to truth so much as his adherence to chivalric rule that prevented him from slaying a woman. It is, however, true that in legend and precept truth holds a high place; only we should add that moral precepts often hide an opposite practice, and that a simple lie (not perjury) was not in and for itself regarded as wrong (the Christian idea); its sin depended on circumstances. But compare Vāyu P. i. 10. 38; 59. 40.

* Compare vii. 57. 4: (numbers of people at a horse-sacrifice) *naṭanartakagandharvāiḥ pūrṇakāir vardhamānakāiḥ, nityodyogāiç, ca krīḍadbhis tatra sma pariharṣitāḥ.*

† *krīḍanto vīṭayā* (*bālāḥ*) *paryacaran*, i. 131. 17 (cf. *krīḍanaka*).

‡ The cow-boy Krishna, refusing homage to the old god Indra, says: 'we are not shut in with doors, nor confined within wall; we have neither fields nor houses; we wander about happily wherever we list, traveling in our wagons. . . Brahmans offer worship with prayer; cultivators of the earth adore their landmarks; but we who tend our herds in the forests and mountains should worship them and our kine [alone].' The same cow-boy and his brother once 'went along sportively, looking like two young elephants. As they roamed about they saw a washerman coloring clothes, and with smiling countenances they went and threw down some of his fine linen. The washerman . . provoked the lads with loud and scurrilous abuse, until Krishna struck him down with his head to the ground, and killed him. Then, taking the clothes, they went their way' (Wilson's translation of V. P. v. 10, 20; pp. 524, 548). Such pictures may represent actual scenes from the life of the cow-boys, though these narratives are meant to glorify the cow-boy god.

§ v. 39. 55; M. vii. 178–179.

‖ iii. 150. 37; v. 72. 44; 73. 27; 37. 23; xv. 10. 42.

But when we come to a closer examination of what the general 'protection' implies, we find that there is an endless complexity of subjects to which the king must pay attention. It were little better than to schedule the possible combinations of all conceivable military, judicial, civil, and domestic affairs, were we to follow closely the lists given to the king to study. All his duties and cares are parceled out in divisions. He obtains his education by the group-system, 'for the realm is a huge concern,' and needs to be studied in all its particulars, each under its proper head.[*]

So technical have become in the late and pseudo-Epic some of the groups of objects of consideration, that, finding them unexplained or over-explained by the commentator, we are unable to analyze them, unless by chance they be repeated with more light. So we read simply: 'Let the king have the six royal qualities, and know the seven means.' The commentator gives us the solution. The six royal qualities are eloquence, bravery, wisdom, learning, (knowledge of) polity, and of (sacred) music.[†] The 'seven means' would be unintelligible, for only 'four means' (of conduct with other unfriendly kings) are recognized in the legal codes (pacification, generosity, intrigue, and punishment); but to these are here added three: namely, poison, incantations, and magic.

The Epic outstrips the groups with which we are familiar in many other particulars, some of which I shall give in full, dry as they are to any but one interested in succinct tabulation; for though they teach us not much (containing generally only such information as might be antecedently expected), they yet show us, as we pick our way through them, how thoroughly the Hindu sages had encircled the king with a net of painful rules, and give us at the same time a glimpse of that methodic nature of the Hindu mind which proved so valuable in other provinces, while it seems so useless in this. Such categories are usually reeled off in the form of catechumenical instructions addressed to a patient king; and they belong all to the middle period of the Epic, when it was made into a book of wisdom.[‡]

---

[*] xii. 58. 21; *sumahat tantram*; so ib. 56. 2, (*dharmam*) *mahāntam bhāram manye.*

[†] Gain, Right, and Desire, it has just been stated, are the main-springs of human action; these the king should practice in loco (*kāle*): ii. 5. 21 ff. The most common 'group of six' is called the 'six-fold-care' (not to be confused with the 'six-fold array' of the army, described below), and consists of six specially important topics for the king: namely, alliance, war, marching, encampment, partition of forces, and seeking allies. Compare ii. 5. 8; v. 38. 24 (xii. 59. 32); xii. 69. 64 ff.; xv. 6. 5 (*ṣāḍguṇyam āyattam*); M. vii. 160; Yājñ. i. 346.

[‡] Some of these lists presuppose not only great technical dexterity in interpretation, but also a sense of less serious meaning than belongs to

There are 'eight acts' for a king to attend to (that is, eight subjects to care for in time of peace): agriculture, trade, roads, forts, bridges, elephant-training, taxes, and the occupation of deserted places.* Some of these are embraced in an unintelligible 'group of fourteen' just preceding, objects to be attended to when the land is held by the enemy: as, for instance, the country, town, forts, elephants, liquor-saloons, etc. (commentator); and in another place we find again that there are 'ten objects of consideration,' explained by the same guide to be the king's own and his foe's ministers, realm, fortress, treasury, and army.†

---

most of them. They appear almost in the light of riddles or implied conundrums, and have a painful resemblance to Mother Goose verses, reminding us of 'two legs sat upon three legs,' etc. Nevertheless, when we find the interpretation, it partakes of no sportiveness. But I fancy the priests amused themselves in a sober way with such verses; there can, at least, be no Sūtra-like technicality about them. A sage will give us an example from v. 33. 44: 'By means of one perceiving two and subduing three by means of four while conquering five, understanding six and forsaking seven—be thou blessed.' It does not clear the matter up much to insert definite articles or the gender of each numeral; and in fact the commentator does not know what the verse means, for he explains it by different guesses, the cleverest being as follows: 'The verse may mean: the king shall by means of one undivided intelligence discern the two sets of things, those to be done and not to be done; and by means of the four methods of subduing foes (soothing, bribery, dissension, force) get into his power the three kinds of men, friends, neutrals, foes; while he shall subdue the five organs of sense and know the six conditions of a state (alliance, rupture, etc.), and leave the seven vices, women, dice, hunting, drinking, harsh words, cruel punishment, injury to property—and then he will be happy.' But in ib. 36. 48 there are six organs. One such specimen suffices.

* ii. 5. 22; these 'acts' are said to be 'declared by the code.' The last (*çūnyānāṁ niveçanam*) may perhaps be colonization. Compare M. vii. 154, where the same (unexplained) group is mentioned, and expounded by the there commentators in the way of Nīl., and otherwise. (See notes to M. in Bühler's and B. H.'s translations.)

† xii. 57. 18, *vettā ca daçavargasya sthānavṛddhikṣayātmanaḥ*. The 'sixfold division' in a near and subsequent section (*ṣaḍvargo nītijaḥ*) is said to mean self, time-and-clime, means, duty, minister, cause, xii. 59. 32: compare the following for the whole list of duties (33–78). The threefold division (*kṣaya, sthāna, vṛddhi*) occurs independently in xii. 69. 64 ff.; where also duty, gain, and desire, as usual, form another triad (so v. 39. 40): and 'guarding the people well' is at the end the sum of it all, according to Angiras; the section closing with the oft-repeated discussion of the relation between the king and his age: whether the king influences his age, or the age in which he lives determines the character of the king (79 ff.). Here, too, are the 'seven divisions of the kingdom' already alluded to (see above, p. 45, and again in text, ii. 5. 23): namely, the king, his officials, allies, wealth, realm, fort, and army. With xii. 59. 35 ff. compare xv. 6. 1 ff. Note that in xv. 5. 8 we have 'an eight-fold state,' *aṣṭāṅgaṁ rājyam*, explained as 'king, ministers, etc.' (i. e. seven); but, I think, really confused with the 'army of eight.' Most of these groups occur explained in the late polity-books, such as Kām. Nīt. and Nītiprak.

Perhaps the most interesting group is that of the state officials (which comes under the rubric of categories of occupations, because, like most of the others, the king has to be occupied with them), since they can be compared with the list of royal officials handed down by Megasthenes. The latter says that there are certain high state officers, partly civil and partly military, and these make in his report a special class by themselves.

In Nārada's speech, quoted above from the second book, we find seven general state officers—the inspector of the fort, the inspector of the army, the inspector of laws, the commander-in-chief of the army, the chief priest, physician, and astrologer—offered as a group explanatory of the functions of certain officials that represent the king (comm. to ii. 5. 23); but a fuller group of administrative officials is implied by the text itself in a following verse, where a group of eighteen officials is plainly signified by the mention of 'eighteen objects which the king should have carefully watched by spies.' Assuming that the commentator is right in explaining this group by a long quotation from a law-book, we find that the people here intended embrace those members of the council meant by Megasthenes, and others who were not probably included under his sixth division, but may be understood of those that guard the realm,* as viceroys in different parts of the kingdom. The list is as follows: the chief councillor, the chief priest, the crown-prince, the commander-in-chief of the army, the chamberlain, the overseer of the harem, the overseer of prisons, the chief steward, the person having general superintendence of what ought or ought not to be done in affairs, the chief judge, the overseer of the city, the chief engineer, the overseer of justice, the president of the assembly, the guardian of the army (commissioner) or of punishment (criminal judge?), the guardian (perhaps overseer) of forts, the guardian of the boundary, the guardian of the forest.

All these officers in his foe's realm the king must have watched by spies, and all of them in his own realm, except the chief councillor (prime minister) and high-priest (because these are of the priestly caste), and his once son, the crown-prince. The list will give us an idea of the internal policy of the state, though no great antiquity can probably be claimed for it.*

---

* It seems to me that Müller goes too far in supposing that the officials set over villages are merely revenue officers with police jurisdiction ('India,' p. 47). The Praçna Up. alludes to these: 'as a king commands his officers, saying, rule over these or those villages' (iii. 4); the Bṛhat Saṁhitā speaks of the 'king and his followers' who destroy the land (xix. 3); and the Epic regards them as viceroys of state. When villages were not tributary, they may have been totally independent (*avilabdha*), they may have had no governor (Bṛ. Sam. xvii. 14, comm., Kern); but when it was possible for Bhīma to give fourteen villages off-hand to a messenger (viii. 76. 40), we can scarcely suppose that the 'self-government' of which Müller speaks could have been a real autonomy, or have made them independent in their laws.

Interesting also is the formal recognition of the relations between state and state—the three kinds of peace (through fear, love, bribery), the four times of marching and army divisions when at war, the division of all outlying principalities into foes, allies, and neutrals, and all the 'circuit' about the king; for these, given also in the law, form the germ of the special sciences of polity, already begun in the Epic, which, starting with rules (*nayāḥ*) such as taught by Brihaspati and Uçanas, were afterward to develop into that Machiavellian state-polity (*nīti*) that in later times governed the policy of the Hindus.

A native résumé of royal occupations found in another book gives us a summary of the king's daily life, and a general theory of his relations with the powers about him. We find here that 'system approved by the Mānavas,' as Kāmandaki calls it, which, corresponding with the suggestions in other parts of the Epic and with the code of Manu, may be looked upon as at once the broadest and the oldest discussion of international relations.† This account is called Instruction, and is given by the old king of Hastināpur to his successor.

The king ought to rise early in the morning,‡ dress, and pay his respects to the elders of the court (here assumed to be necessarily priests). His first business should be to enquire what work there is on hand for the day. This will be explained to him by the elders, and they will also advise him how to act. His councillors (for with the vulgar he must not consult) should be regenerate men, wise, aristocratic, skilled in determining what is right and useful; his general officers should be of hereditary office and superior to deceit (*upādhātītāḥ*, 14; ii. 5. 43). He should consult with his ministers both collectively and individually; and, to do so, should (early in the morning) enter the well-encircled Hall-of-Council (*mantra-gṛham* or *sthalam āruhya*, 22), or, if he choose, may go into any other secret place, such as a wood, hill, or housetop. He should exclude from the place of consultation any people or talking birds (*sārikā ?* compare Ratn.) that might betray what is said. Night consultations are a mistake. When he meets his council, he should make a speech, repeating the formula that declares the sins of those that betray council.[*]

---

* ii. 5. 38. The list reads: *mantrī purohitaç cāi 'va yuvarājaç camūpatiḥ, pañcamo dvārapālaç ca ṣaṣṭho 'ntarveçikas* (sic) *tathā; kārāgārādhikārī ca dravyasaṁcayakṛt tathā, kṛtyākṛtyeṣu cā 'rthānāṁ navamo viniyojakaḥ* (sic); *pradeṣṭā nagarādhyakṣaḥ kāryanirmāṇakṛt tathā, dharmādhyakṣaḥ sabhādhyakṣo daṇḍapālas tripañcamaḥ; ṣoḍaço durgapālaç ca tathā rāṣṭrāntapālakaḥ, aṭavīpālakāntāni tīrthāny aṣṭādaçāi 'va ca.* This corresponds closely, though not exactly, with the determination of the Nītiprakāçika on the same subject, as the latter usually resolves the technical formulæ in accordance with our commentator. The Manavic group of eighteen is one of law-titles (M. viii. 3). Compare A. P. 252. Exactly the same formula as in our text is found also R. ii. 109. 45; in connection with which fact it may not be impertinent to inquire whether it is mere chance that this whole section of the second book in R. corresponds completely in form and often in verse with a section of the same book in Mbh.; and is it accidental that the scenes of the two works are distributed in parallel books with sometimes like names: *ādi* = *ādi*; *sabhā* ≐ (assembly at) *ayodhyā*; *vana* = *vana* (B.); *kiṣkindhyā* = *virāṭa* (with names different, but each a change from forest to town life); *sundara* = *udyogya* (preparation for war); then in each the *yuddha*?

† K. Nīt. viii. 24. Compare with this section ii. 5. 26 ff.; xii. 59; M. vii. 153 ff. The résumé is from xv. 5. 10 to 6. 20.

‡ Compare ii. 5. 86, 89; where it is added that the king, after rising early, should go about protected by a guard of soldiers dressed in red and armed with swords. An interesting list of the king's attendants, jesters, pages, etc., is given in R. ii. 32. 20.

Business affairs[†] and legal matters he should personally superintend, or have attended to by experts and judges (compare xii. 69. 27 ff.) In making judgments, he should condemn to fines or death, according to circumstances, thieves, adulterers, violent men, cheats, and (among others) those that destroy halls and places of assembly.[‡] His morning duties consist also of a conference with those that have the control of his finances. He should then dress, eat, and exercise, examine the arms, and later, in the evening, give audience to ambassadors and interview spies—for he should have well-trained native spies of every sort. The latter part of the night is the proper time for him to decide as to what ought to be done. His meals should be taken at noon and at midnight; but in respect of these divisions of time the general rule is that any time is good for action if there is anything to be done.[§] The next day he should rise, dress, and go through the same duties over again: 'forever turning is the wheel of duty.'[‖] At all times he should take particular care to protect himself from assassination, and have his women especially supervised by proper old men.

---

[*] This may also imply the punishment mentioned for such a betrayer in A. P. 257. 79, where the *mantrasya bhettā* has his tongue slit open:

[†] Part of his business was to regulate prices; for the trader, man of the people-caste, was not to charge for his goods as he chose. In fact, the term usually translated 'usurer' is by native authority a man that buys grain cheap and sells it dear—a great sinner, according to the Hindus. Compare Vās. ii. 41, and Kern, J. R. A. S., N. S., vi. 40, on our text, xiii. 23. 21 (N.).

[‡] The general disposition of the king's day reminds us of the universal rule that one should devote himself to 'duty in the forenoon, wealth in the middle of the day, pleasure in the latter part of the day' (*dharmam pūrve dhanam madhye jaghanye kāmam ācaret, ahany anucared evam eṣa çāstrakṛto vidhiḥ*, iii. 33. 40).

[§] *sarva āupayikāḥ kālāḥ kāryāṇām*, xv. 5. 35.

[‖] *cakravat tāta kāryāṇām paryāyo dṛçyate sadā*, xv. 5. 36.

As to his foreign policy, he must remember that it is all important to have a capable commander-in-chief,* and should elect him that is faithful, brave, painstaking (rather than one only of good family).

Each king is surrounded by a 'circuit' of consideration, and every king should be familiar with his own and his neighbors' affairs. A technical enumeration of these by the teachers of polity makes seventy-two subjects for consideration.†

Owing to the military and not the civil activity of the king being portrayed by the Epic, we have little to judge by, when we enquire how much the king really had to do with the courts and with other legislative matters. As the sovereign is always represented in the code as attending courts, and as judgment is given by the Epic king whenever a case occurs, we may assume that the king actually went each morning to the court-house and heard cases, deciding them by the help of those learned in the law. Such help must have been mainly in quoting precedents, for of all rules this is the strictest, that the law as handed down shall not be changed.* The business was, however, chiefly shifted to the shoulders of the judge, in press of other business, and of course wholly so in all but the imperial city. The king whose justice in judgments is especially sought must always 'let his rod fall alike on friend or foe,'† and, as an incorporation of the God of justice, always opens the court by a set speech, in which he conjures the witnesses to speak the truth. The king himself may not be a witness.‡

---

* Compare (ii. 5. 37) the *eko 'py amātyaḥ çūraḥ.*

† What these subjects are is variously explained. The legal commentators are agreed that Kāmandaki's work shall interpret Manu's vague grouping of the kings; and they are probably correct in so doing. The legal commentator to Manu explains the great circuit of twelve as consisting of five objects of care (minister, kingdom, fort, treasure, army), multiplied into the twelve kings lying about an imaginable king: to wit, that king's foe, the neutral, the one seeking to become an emperor, the one lying geographically between the subject and his foe (these are the four chief), plus eight others, assumed as well known by the text, and explained as four in front beyond the foe (a friend, the foe's friend, friend's friend, foe's friend's friend) and four behind (rear attacker, rear attacker's attacker, friend of rear attacker, friend of rear attacker's attacker). These twelve kings' own persons, added to these sixty subjects, make the complete circuit of care about one's kingdom. But our present text and commentator are different from these. I am sure the latter's interpretation is incorrect, but the Epic commentator construes that a king has seventy-two subjects to think of: four of these are the friend of his foe and foe's ally and the foe of each respectively; six are those bearing arms against him; two are his own ally and that ally's ally; these twelve are to be added to sixty objects of consultation with ministers—namely, a group of eight on agriculture. etc., of twenty on boys, etc., of fourteen faults, impiety, etc., of eighteen objects of counsel (cf. the eighteen of ii. 5. 38 as explained above). These make seventy-two altogether (reading, as N. does, *mitram amitram*, as in C.). The late date of the corresponding passage in Manu might be inferred from the fact that Uçanas alone is quoted, when an author is mentioned by name (7. 15), although 'polity-wise teachers' (*ācāryā nītikovidāḥ*) are alluded to in general (compare M. vii. 155–156; Kām. Nīt. viii. 14–24; ib. xi. 67). The seventy concerns of the circuit are dismissed in the twelfth book with the remark that the whole subject is fully explained in the Nītiçāstra (59. 74). However, if we trust Kāmandaki, the Mānavas have a right to claim the system, since he says the 'circuit' covers twelve provinces according to Manu (vii. 156), or sixteen, or twenty, according to Uçanas and Brihaspati respectively; although others, he adds, allow the circuit to be expanded according to present need (loc. cit.). The same circuit is mentioned in xii. 59. 70–71, and implied in ib. 48; perhaps implied also in *pārṣṇimūla*, ii. 5. 58, Later works agree in essentials: compare A. P. 232, 234, 238 ff. Compare Vikramorv. Act ii., Wilson's note, p. 209.

If an unjust sentence be delivered in court, the general rule that a king shall assume one-sixth of the moral responsibility when crime is committed is commuted in favor of the people versus the king, so as to read that the king obtains one-fourth; the ministers of justice, one-fourth; the witnesses, one-fourth; the criminal, one-fourth, of the moral guilt (to be cleared off by suffering in the next world).§

---

* In accordance with the general rule *rājarṣīṇām purāṇānām anuyātu gatiṁ nṛpaḥ*, xv. 4. 5 (though here custom only): compare ii. 6. 3. The judge judges, but the king condemns, in Mṛcch. Act ix., a good court-picture.

† See below, and compare R. iv. 17. 57.

‡ A list in v. 35. 44 gives, besides, seven people incapable of serving as witnesses: a person that tells fortunes by the hand; a trader (convicted of having been) a thief; a fowler; a physician; a friend and a foe (of the person on trial); a mime-actor. Compare M. viii. 65 ff.

§ The absolute moral responsibility of the king that permits crime to go unpunished is represented by a sixth of that crime. If the crime be punished, the king is freed from moral responsibility for the commission of that sin (see above, pp. 21, 31). If, however, in punishing the crime, the king or the king's representative, the judge, gives an unjust sentence, the moral responsibility is in part shifted back to the shoulders of the government. This later rule (as it seems to me) of one-fourth incurred by the king thus overlies the earlier and proverbial 'sixth share' of the king. I look now on the passages in the thirtieth book of the Epic and the eighth book of Manu as alike indicative of a later court-precision than is shown by the popular rule; and am inclined to believe that the confusion in the pseudo-Epic is due not to a quotation 'from Manu' without authority, but to the temporary ignoring of the popular view in favor of the court-division of guilt as explained in M. viii. 18; and therefore that this quotation direct 'from Manu' is really from our law-book. We should thus have to subtract one case from those which I adduced where the pseudo-Epic failed to correspond with our Manavic text, and thereby strengthen my argument a little more. Add xii. 266. 5. Compare this Journal xi. 264; also M. viii. 18, and 304, with my notes in translation; the Epic passages here treated are chiefly xiii. 61. 34 ff., and xii. 67. 17 ff. Sūtra-rules for the statements given above in regard to witnesses will be found B. i. 10. 19. 13; ib. 8; ib. 10; Vās. xvi. 32; in Manu compare also viii. 88 ff.. 113.

Verification of a witness's word by fire-ordeals and tests ot other sorts goes back to an early period in India (AV., Chānd. Up. vi. 16, etc.), and extends in new phases through the later legal literature. Compare the Parīkṣāpaddhati (McNaughten); Schlagintweit, *Gottesurtheile der Indier*. The fourteen days' limit as a test of veracity after an ordeal invoking the wrath of a god is kept till late.* In the Epic we have no fire-ordeal, properly speaking, such as we have in the Rāmāyaṇa. In the latter the heroine swears 'by her troth' that she is true to her husband, calls on the fire to protect her, and therewith enters fire (R. vi. 101. 11, 28 ff.). In the same scene in the Mahābhārata she simply calls on all the gods to 'deprive her of life if she act falsely,' and begins the list with the fire-god (*mātariçvan*), not employing any further proof than the formula *sa me vimuñcatu prāṇān yadi pāpaṁ carāmy aham.*† In all the Epic poetry the custom is popularized by the common unjudicial forms of strong asseveration. To swear 'by my troth' is common, as 'by my troth I will slay him; by my troth I raise the weapon' (iii. 252. 43). A colloquial imprecation is '*ruat caelum* (*pated dyauḥ*) if my word be not true;' and to this the speaker adds the more local imprecation 'may Himavat burst, may the sea dry up,' etc. (compare iii. 12. 130 ff.; R. ii. 15. 29). The great curse of the seers as a form of imprecation in xiii. 93. 116 ff. deserves notice as suggestive of ordeals. Again, to give more solemnity, a speech is introduced by the speaker while touching water (*vāry upaspṛçya*): evidently an elliptical form of calling Varuṇa, the Epic god of water and of testimony, to observe the truth of the words to follow.‡

The unanimous treatment of one topic in all the older law-books leads us to the conclusion that, at a time earlier than we have been considering (with a state so adjusted to precise formalities as that prescribed above the practice must have been incompatible), the king acted not only the part of a judge but also that of the punisher. The time would go back of the appointment of a judge-substitute, and represent a period when the king was the head of a small family clan. In the Epic period, the practice could have been one only typical of the royal death-giving power, and conversely of the pardoning power. For we read in all codes that, when a thief is caught (and trial for theft seems the earliest kind of judicial inquiry in India), he shall bear a club upon his shoulder to the king, and when his guilt is acknowledged the king shall take the club and slay him, or he shall let him go free by not slaying him. But one code says they shall bear him away and then kill him.* So even in Bṛhannār. P. the slave is struck, *musalyaḥ*, by the king himself, 28. 20. Not even the members of the king's family are to be allowed to escape the just punishment of their crime: 'He must punish even his next of kin with bonds, torture, or death.' An interesting exception moderates this: 'if, however, these should come to the family-priest and voluntarily confess their crime, saying, "we have sinned; we will not sin (again)"—then they deserve to be let go.' Moreover, of priests it is said: the punishment of priests shall be graded progressively according to their social standing. 'The greater the reverence they enjoyed before they sinned, the greater should be their punishment.'†

---

* A. P. 254. 48. Cf. also Vāyu P. ii. 15. 73, *tulā*, 100; Mṛcch. Act ix.

† iii. 291. 23. Compare Kaegi. *Herkunft d. germ. Gottesurtheils*, p. 51.

‡ So in iii. 10. 32, where the speaker was angered through his hearer's insulting him by 'scratching the ground' and 'beating his thighs' in mockery (although the latter act is not necessarily an insult, being also a sign of grief, as when the women 'beat their thighs with their hands and lamented,' as an equal sign of grief with loosening the hair and doffing ornaments: xvi. 7. 17). To swear by all the gods is also common. Compare the oath in the battle-scenes below, and add R. ii. 9. 25.

More specific legal functions of the king are lacking. His duties in peace are chiefly those of his natural profession. Thus, he is expected to visit the armory or arsenal as well as to see to business matters. Only the books on custom and law give us details of his entering the court, etc.‡ The general distribution of the king's whole realm is put in short form under four heads, so that, when one enquires briefly and politely in regard to the state of the kingdom, he says that he hopes the 'kingdom, treasury, army, and town' are faring well.*

---

* This law is older than the present Epic, and may have been current at the time of the first poem; but I have noted no allusion to it in our text. There the king is more a figure-head in the court. But for the Sūtra-period and law compare G. xii. 43; B. ii. 1. 1. 116–17; Vās. xx. 41; Āp. i. 9. 25. 4; M. viii. 314; xi. 100; Yājñ. iii. 257. The later law-books limit this case, as being very severe, to the case of one that steals gold from a priest! But it is evidently a survival of earliest criminal law. The slaying of criminals ordinarily may be simple (beheading, etc.), or 'variegated (*citro vadhaḥ*): that is, slaying by torture. The Epic allows robbers to be slain by beating (*prahārāiḥ*) in its pseudo-parts (xii. 85. 20 ff.), and gives us a tale of a saint, caught by the police, and then at the king's order 'impaled on a stake from suspicion of theft' (*çūle protaç çāuraçaṅkayā*). His companions, real thieves, were also slain in the same way: i. 63. 92. Compare xvi. 1. 31, impalement for drinking. Priests are thus capitally punished also, and others slain for theft, by Puranic law, Ag. P. 169. 20; 226. 35 ff.; in ib. 31, *lex talionis*; but night robbers are impaled, also destroyers of houses and fields, ib. 226. 54–63. The first citation is remarkable as preserving the exact form of M. xi. 100 ff., the priest being the thief. But in 257. 59 the priest is branded where others are slain (for abusive language); ib. 62, the stake is appointed for murderers; see also ib. 173. 2 ff.

† xii. 268. 29, 7 ff. So, too, in xii. 140. 47: 'either a son, brother, father, or friend—whoever injures the property of the king, shall be slain; even the Guru shall be punished.'

‡ Compare Pār. G. S. iii. 13. 1 ff.; M. viii. 1 ff

In regard to the comparative value of different parts of the kingdom, we are frequently told that a king should preserve his own life even at the expense of the whole realm, just as he should sacrifice a family to preserve a village, and a village, if necessary, in order to preserve a town.†

4. *Modes of government.*—The origin of the great families that gave kings to the Aryan invaders of India is confessed by themselves to be doubtful. The difficulty of tracing back the line, though helped by fable, appeared to them insurmountable. 'The origin of seers, rivers, great families, women, and sin is not to be found out' (v. 35. 72: cf. Panc. iv. 49); for 'hard to discover are the sources of rivers and heroes' (i. 137. 11). The multiplication of fable, the absence of all history, make it impossible to know to-day what was unknown then. We can be certain of nothing in regard to the origin of any of the kings mentioned in the Epic. We cannot show that the Dhritarāshtra of the poem was the same as the king of that name mentioned in the Brāhmana-literature. Pretense of descent is openly acknowledged in the poem. 'The present royal families,' it is said, 'pretend descent from Āila, Ikshvāku, etc.' (ii. 14. 1–5). Of pure-caste kings there is not even this pretense in many cases. The mother is often low-born, or the father is a 'divinity.' Although especially referable to the Brahmans, a remark in the twelfth book is interesting in this connection: 'There are only four really ancient families, those of Angiras, Kaçyapa, Vasishtha and Bhrigu; all other families have become great by virtue of works (not blood).'‡

According to the received belief in the Epic, royalty, though a divine ordinance, is really the result of an afterthought on the part of the Creator; for man lived originally in a democratic, or rather anarchic, manner. 'How,' asks the king of the Pāndus, 'can one person have such power over others?' The sage questioned answers (xii. 59. 10 ff.): 'Hear how kingship arose: At first there was neither king nor kingdom, nor punishment, nor one to inflict it; but when man's sense of justice was destroyed, then they laid hands on the property of others; this begot desire; desire, passion; passion caused a loss of all knowledge of duty; holy knowledge was destroyed;

---

* *papraccha kuçalaṁ cā 'sya rājye koṣe bale pure*, R. ii. 99. 10..

† i. 115. 38; v. 128. 49; compare ib. 37. 16 ff.: let him sacrifice his wealth to save his wife, but his wife to save his own life;' and xii. 57. 41.

‡ xii. 297. 17–18, the *mūlagotrāṇi* (aristocratic through birth) and the *karmataḥ samutpannāni* (sprung up through works); the commentator takes the works to be religious ceremonies.

then died the sense of right; the gods became frightened; they created Law and Order; till finally one man, righting the uneven earth, brought the world into a state of order, blessed them by his protecting and directing power, and was thereupon, on account of his kindness, made king.[*] I have elsewhere[†] given a somewhat similar legend, in which the kingless world is represented as begging God for a protector. These legends show that such a state was not unfamiliar to the Hindu, though they would do but little toward supporting an argument for early democracies in India. Still, we know from other sources that kingless peoples, *αὐτόνομοι*, were probably not wanting in the later period. Megasthenes plainly implies that 'self-ruled cities,' in distinction from cities governed by kings, were common in his day. Indeed, his words take such towns as a matter of course.[‡] Yet none but legendary traces remain even of such a possibility in our Epic, though so many passages are aimed at 'kingless people' that we might well suppose it was not a merely theoretical folly that was thus decried.[§] 'King' and 'warrior' are sometimes said to be synonymous,[‖] but whether a king of Aryans may belong to other than the warrior-caste is not a question answered (except in the case of Karṇa) by the historical part of the Epic.[¶] The didactic part speaks plainly, however. We learn thence that in emergencies kings may be of any caste. Yudhishthira asked: 'Suppose the castes confused, and a hostile army appearing; suppose the regular troops defeated; then suppose some strong man should arise, even a priest, a man of the people-caste, or a slave: if he protected the people (as king), would he do right or not?' The sage replies: 'He that is a shore in a shoreless place, he that is a boat in a boatless place, whether he be a slave or whatever he be, is worthy of honor. Let the people honor him on whom when helpless they rely and prosper; let them honor him as if he were their own blood; for a priest without knowledge and a king without protecting-power are but wooden elephants. He that protects the good and drives evil away should be made king.'* This passage explains 'caste-mixture'; it is political confusion, implying war.

---

[*] *rañjitāç ca prajāḥ sarvās tena rāje 'ti çabdyate*, verse 125.

[†] Manu in the Mahābhārata, on Mbh. xii. 67. 17 ff.: J. A. O. S. xi. 255.

[‡] Compare Lassen I. A. ii. 727 and 86; Vaiçālī was such a city; it had a council of five thousand; each member provides one elephant; they had an *uparāja* or under-king, as state officer, under whom was a commander-in-chief of the army; they had also a 'book of customs.'

[‡] 'Faults are always engendered in a people that has no king' (*arājake janapade*), i. 41. 27; R. ii. 69. 28; 'in realms without kings the people having no helper are destroyed,' i. 105. 44 ff.: cf. M. vii. 3. Less suggestive is 'like a stoneboat in a river sinks a people ruled by a woman, a gambler, or a child,' v. 38. 43; here the rule is directed against a woman or child being *anuçāsitā*, actual ruler of the state; but immediately following it is said 'grievous is the land where there is no king,' v. 39. 78; as a command we find: 'one shall not live in realms that have no kings,' xii. 67. 4 ff.; with a description familiar from the law of what evils would happen in such a case: 'women and money would be stolen, people would devour each other like fishes;' (and the addition) 'this was the state of the world before Manu was made king; previous to his arrival people had tried to make laws for themselves; these laws were "a boaster, a bully, an adulterer, a thief must be banished;" no one enforced these laws; so the people were miserable; so they asked for a king.'

[‖] The Nītimayūkha (Rāj. Mitra's Notices, No. 2278), says that the word king refers only to one of warrior-caste: *rājaçabdasya kṣatriyamātre çaktir iti nirūpaṇam.* But this is theoretical; and for the use in the book itself, I know this work only as mentioned here and in Weber's account, *Monatsberichte d. k. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, Nov. 1873.

[¶] The Vāyu-Purāṇa sets the evil period of slave-kings at a time not very long (relatively) before the ascension of Chandragupta ('who will reign for twenty-four years') and Açoka; but quite a while before the Yavanas, who are to reign for eighty years: Vāyu P. ii. 37. 321 ff., 356.

5. *Succession, choice of king, primogeniture.*—The kingdom either descended directly to the king's eldest son without question, or the new king was chosen by popular election. Such were the earliest conditions in India,† but the latter case is at all periods rare, and probably unknown in the Epic age.‡ If, however, the people had lost the right of determining absolutely the next occupant of the throne, they still retained, as we see them through historical legends, in a limited though irregular form, the power of modifying the choice determined on by the aristocracy.§ They have still the unchallenged right of protesting against what seems to them an unworthy choice for their next ruler, and dare to deny any such choice to the present king, if it does not coincide with their views. And if

---

* xii. 78. 35 ff. In a later period, Pariah kings were recognized.

† Compare Zimmer, *Altind. Leb.*, p. 162, 172.

‡ *janmataḥ pramāṇena jyeṣṭho rājā yudhiṣṭhiraḥ*, i. 115. 25. The extraordinary statement in Parāç. G. S. i. 68, that 'royalty does not depend on hereditary right, but on acquisition by the sword' is well omitted by the commentator. It must be a late interpolation.

§ In the event of an undisputed succession, and the crown-prince being a minor on the king's death, the kingdom is kept for the prince by an older relative who governs it as if he were king, according to the Epic practice (i. 102. 1: *hate citrāṅgade bhīṣmo bāle bhrātari . . pālayāmāsa tad rājyaṁ satyavatyāmate sthitaḥ*; but see 101. 13, *vicitravīryaḥ . . bhīṣmasya vacane sthitaḥ . . anvaçāsat . . pitṛpāitāmaham padam*). But the boy had a nominal sovereignty, and the dowager queen's authority is said to be respected. The representative is here the elder brother, who in consequence of a vow could not succeed to the throne. The boy-prince (still *bāla* and *aprāptayāuvana*) was not sixteen, and consequently a minor. In the Rāmāyaṇa, on the king's death the whole control of government is immediately assumed by the family-priest, and a session of subordinate priests (R. ii. 69). It will be noticed that no such spiritual guidance of the state is found in the interregnum recorded in the Mahābhārata, although we have instances of kings deluded enough to let the royal power fall into the priests' hands: but this is emphatically stated to be a folly (see below) we find that in no such case the people gain their point, it is still not less instructive to observe in what manner they lose it; for in each example that legend has preserved we see that the king is obliged to make good his choice (never by force, but) by arguments addressed in a respectful manner to the protests of the people. The inner meaning of such legends seems to be that the king was not yet an absolute monarch. The people's constitution was the tradition of their race. This the king dared virtually to annul; but he did not yet venture to set it aside without a pretext, nor did he feel himself independent of the veto that the people had the power of declaring. 'They say that the warrior-caste owes its superiority to physical might;'* but this physical might depended on the good-will of the people; as its moral power rested in the approbation of the priest, to whom 'the warrior-caste stands nearest.'†

A word before giving the legends. The greatest sorrow to a Hindu was lack of a son, since the latter's services in rendering oblations to the manes were necessary to procuring salvation ‡ for the father. If, in addition, the father was a king, and saw his power likely to pass into another line in default of an own son to succeed him, we may imagine what distress was that sonless king's who saw before him at once a prospective loss of private happiness and of family honor. So great seemed this danger that a proverb arose, 'one son is no son;' and, lest an only son should die and leave the afflicted and aged father in a worse condition than before, every means was tried to secure at least two possible heirs.§

---

* *balajyeṣṭhaḥ*, i. 123. 11; *kṣatriyāṇām balaṁ jyeṣṭham*, i. 137. 11.

† iii. 147. 2. These tales, it will be noted, represent the people as a whole (including as a general thing the priests) against the king. We may say that the legend was created to honor the priest, but it seems to me more probable that the general legend was there, and the priest a mere spokesman. For the legends are an Epic growth, as is plainly seen, from an earlier form. Had the priest desired his own glory, he would, in telling the story, have excluded the people, and represented himself alone as the advocate of justice.

‡ i. 159. 5: compare *punnāmno narakāt*, e. g. R. ii. 115. 12.

§ Perhaps the most extreme case of this national dread of sonlessness is shown in the boy Jantu, a legend that may perhaps not be all legend, and is interesting also as adding another to the few recorded stories of human sacrifice. The story in brief is that before the birth of the boy his father had lived long and married a hundred wives, but obtained only one son. An accident causing the king to reflect on the precarious nature of the boy's life, he asked his priests how he could obtain more children. They advised him to sacrifice the boy, promising that each wife should then bear a son. This sacrifice is determined on and carried out, 'the mother shrieking in despair like a bird over its slain offspring.' The boy is bound, laid on the altar, sacrificed, and burned. Of course the priests' prediction is realized; iii. 127–128. Compare the distress of Rāma's father in like circumstances, etc. The same idea, that one son is little better than none, meets us in Il. xxiv. 538-540.

The normal succession is shown in the case of Daçaratha and Rāma. The former had several worthy sons. They grew up and married. The eldest was a model prince, beloved by the people and by his father. So the king had a consultation with the *sacivas* or military ministers and the family priests in regard to the time for consecrating the prince in the 'crown-princeship' (*yuvarājya*). These military and priestly ministers (*mantriṇaḥ*, including both) agreed that the time was now; and the family priest was told to make ready for the ceremony (the 'consecration' of the prince being a formal religious ceremony). Here the king assumes the succession, and asks the advice of the ministers as to the time for the ceremony; and nothing further would have occurred, were it not for the machinations of a queen, who binds the king to change his mind. But the indicated line of action is the ordinary procedure.*

I have now to show, in so far as legendary illustration may, 1. That, if there are two sound sons, the king had no allowed right to select other than the eldest as heir, and if he exceeded his right in this regard the people openly and threateningly called him to account for his departure; 2. that in a case where, on account of disease or legal uncertainty, the legitimate heir in the family was doubtful, the people reserved to themselves the selection between the disputed aspirants; 3. that the people are said to have elected a king, or in another case to have made king and declared as such the infant son of their former king—the point I wish to bring out in the last case being the assumed necessity of ratification on the part of the people of what we should naturally suppose to have needed no such sanction. But the people's election is always limited to a choice from one family (in the Epic tradition) of their own people. I shall premise by saying that, in general, the assumption is that the eldest son is the natural heir, as Yudhishthira is virtually king alone, and has no sharer of his regal dignity, high as stood his brothers in his own and in popular esteem.†

---

* iii. 277. 1 ff.; 7, *mantrayāmāsa sacivāir dharmajñāiç ca purohitāiḥ.*

† The Rāmāyaṇa of course knows only direct succession, to the eldest. Any other transfer was a crime. Compare R. ii. 7. 18–19 for a true summary: *bahūnām api putrāṇām eko rājye 'bhiṣicyate jyeṣṭheṣu putreṣu rājyatantrāṇi pārthivā āsajanti* (and these again on their eldest, never on their brothers). It is quite possible, however, that in an earlier form of our poem the brothers shared more or less in the regal power. Yudhishthira is certainly treated very contemptuously, and badgered a good deal (even in our present version), by his two brothers (compare the gambling scene, and that after Abhimanyu's death). Zimmer makes it probable that an early family-rule existed in some cases, becoming an individual sovereignty only through the audaciousness of one member, who made himself 'the sole ruler,' perhaps with his relatives' consent. Compare Zimmer, pp. 176–7; and for other verses on the subject from the Rāmāyaṇa see R. ii. 86. 10 (cf. 88. 12); iv. 17. 30, where 'three fathers' are the natural father, the teacher, and the eldest brother.

1. A king had caused it to be known that he intended to make his younger son heir, because the eldest had revolted, or (in another version) had not obeyed his wishes. Thereupon the people, headed by the priests, came *en masse* and demanded how he could do this; protesting that a younger son might not 'overstep' the elder, and closing this formal address with the words: 'This we make known to thee; see that thou do thy duty.' The king now mildly argues with the people, and says sophistically that a son who opposes his father is by good men regarded as not being a son at all, 'and the law of Çukra (a semi-divine authority) has induced me to do this.' In consequence solely of these arguments, the people retire and submit: not because of the king's will, but because of his reasoning; and in closing they say expressly, 'and if it is Çukra who has commanded it, there is no more to say.' Thus it was that Yayāti was enabled to establish Pūru his younger son as heir instead of Yadu, his eldest.*

2. As Pāndu the younger son received the kingdom because his brother was defective, 'for the gods do not approve of a defective king' (v. 149. 25), so another ancient legend of the family shows in its Epic form an otherwise legitimate heir deprived of the throne for the same reason by the decision of the people.† Pratīpa (great grandfather of Vāsudeva) had three sons, Devāpi, Bālhīka, Çantanu. Although the eldest was a leper, he was yet much beloved by the king, by his brothers, and by the people. No one opposed his succession until his father (who had set his heart on Devāpi's reigning) had made all the preparations necessary to install him as heir-apparent. But in vain was the king's desire. For 'the priests, the seniors (the old councillors), the inhabitants of the city and of the country, forbade his consecration.'‡ This sudden uprising was due to the people's objection to having a leper as sovereign, and their refusal succeeded, without a word of

---

* i. 85. 22 ff.; v. 149. 1 ff. Compare V. P. iv. 10; Vāyu P. ii. 31. 75.

† Compare the different accounts of Devāpi in Muir's Sanskrit Texts, i. 273 ff. The Matsya asserts that the 'people' in general discarded him. The tale is old, and found thus in the Nirukta (ii. 10), but with the important modification that Çantanu unrighteously got the kingdom without mention of the people. The V. P. (iv. 20. 7 ff.) coincides with the Nirukta version, except in the return of the elder as *purohita*. He is here an unbeliever. In the first book of the Epic we have only the religious zeal of Devāpi given as reason for his becoming a hermit. Compare i. 94. 61; Weber, *Ind. St.* i. 203. This king Çantanu had (i. 95. 46) the power of healing age by touch. Compare Vāyu P.: *yaṁ yaṁ rājā spṛçati vāi jīrṇaṁ samayato naram, punar yuvā sa bhavati tasmāt te çantanuṁ viduḥ.* and thence in the next verse his 'renowned *çantanutvam*'; a good instance of myth from name (Vāyu P. ii. 37. 232), and *çlokas* from single words (see Epic verse).

‡ *pāurajānapadāḥ*, etc., *nivārayāmāsuḥ*, v. 149. 28.

anger on the part of the king. The eldest son soon retired into the woods, and the youngest reigned at his father's death.*

---

* Not the second son; for the latter, Bālhīka, long before convinced that his elder brother would succeed to the throne, had left the realm and gone to his mother's brother, by whom he was adopted, and to whose throne he ultimately succeeded, permitting his father's throne to pass into the possession of his younger brother. This part of the story has also historical interest. It is his mother's brother to whom the prince goes. I think the gradual rising of the person called 'mother's brother' has never been noticed. This relative is in the time of the Epic the nearest after those of one's own home. In the war-cries, for instance, as will be seen in the next division of this paper, it is always the 'mother's brother' on whom, next to father and brother, an endangered soldier calls for aid. In fact, the mother's brother is the one prominent uncle; no exception to this general rule being found in the case of Vidura, to whom the Pāndus say 'Thou art our father's brother,' and appeal to him for aid (ii. 78. 7); since I do not mean, of course, that the *pitṛvya* (*patruus*) vanishes, or that, when he is present and offers aid, he is not, as in this case, termed by the suppliants 'father's brother, like a father.' But when no relative is present, then the 'mother's brother,' not the 'father's brother,' is invoked or spoken of as the uncle *par excellence.* This is e. g. illustrated in fable, as where the demure cat says to the foolish mice 'I will be your guardian, I will be a mother's brother to you' (v. 160. 33). The curious thing about the matter is that this is a new, not an old view of uncleship. For after the Epic come the Purāṇas, and here we find this preponderance of the mother's brother to a still greater extent. Thus we have in the Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa a list of *gurus*, or 'venerable persons' (see end of note); and among them, although the 'mother's brother' appears, we find no 'father's brother.' The Vāyu Purāṇa (ii. 8. 87) says that 'a son favors his mother's brother, a daughter her fathers, and the son is like his mother:' as if this were an attempt to account for the prominence of the mother's brother ('favor' is really in a Yankee sense, and means resemble, as the text shows: *mātulam bhajate putraḥ pitṝn bhajati kanyakā, yathāçīlā bhaven mātā tathāçīlo bhavet sutaḥ*). But this (it is curious to note) is quite opposed to the older law-books, in which we find the father's brother mentioned first—e. g. when honor is to be shown—and the mother's mentioned last. Thus in Vās. xix. 31 (quoted above, p. 43) we find that the king is to support his queen's 'father's brother, mother's brother;' and in G. vi. 7 salutation is enjoined only for the wife of the father's brother; and ib. 9, where the uncles themselves are saluted, the *patruus* precedes. The same in Āpastamba (i. 4. 14. 11), where the father's brother precedes. So also in G. v. 27, when the *madhuparka* is offered, the father's brother is mentioned first,; and the same order obtains in the house-laws of Āçvalāyana (i. 24. 4). Manu is later, although in one instance, where the mother's brother is mentioned first (ii. 130), we have afterwards the father's sister (ib. 133) before the mother's sister (131 reverses this, as does Vishnu xxxii. 3). But in general Manu stands with the Epic; thus, in iii. 119, only the *mātula* is honored when returning from a journey (compare ib. 148); and in iv. 179 the only uncle one should not dispute with is the mother's brother, though in general relatives of both father and mother follow; for 'a mother and maternal relatives' are the most important (ib. 183). Whether this change is purely linguistic (*mātula* becomes uncle in general), or represents the growth of 'divided families' (M. ix. 111), I cannot say. It would seem to imply that the mother's brother was in the home more than the father's brother, just as we see that Çakuni, the bosom-friend of Hastina's crown-prince and constant resident in his palace, was his mother's brother. The

This story, given as history, is interesting, on account of the changes introduced into it by the Epic. For in the older version of the Nirukta the priests alone state to the younger brother, who here takes the throne from the elder, that his act is wrong, and convince him that he is a usurper. The Epic, on the other hand, puts the whole people forward as introducing a democratic remonstrance, with the priests as their mouth-piece. To the Epic compilers, therefore, it seemed natural that the people should be in this state of quasi-revolt; or they found the legend changed thus, and representing such a tone as this.

Again, the case of the settlement of the claims between the Pāndus and Kurus themselves — the plot of the whole play. The question to the Hindus is exceedingly complicated. Dhritarāshtra, the natural heir in the first generation, was blind and excluded from the throne; his younger brother, Pāndu, reigned, but resigned the throne to become a hermit. This obliged Dhritarāshtra to rule (the other possible heirs we can overlook in this connection). The sons of each grow up together. Dhritarāshtra installs his nephew as heir-apparent, either from a sense of right or through fear of the people (i. 139. 1–2). And what happens? His own sons conspire to get the throne. The king changes his mind in regard to the heir. Then the people murmured against the king (Dhritarāshtra), and said that his son was not so brave or so good as the nephew; and therefore they would have the nephew for king. They feared a plot, and became even bolder. 'They met in courtyards and on the streets, and in assemblies,' and demanded that the king should be dethroned, and his nephew not only installed as future king but made king at once. 'For how,'

---

list of *gurus* or venerable persons alluded to above is, though late, interesting enough to quote in full. It is from the Bṛhannārad. Purāṇa, 9. 88 ff., and is followed by a foolish passage which maintains that after all the best *guru* is he that studies the Purāṇas (an evident addition to the list, preceded by an interruption). This list reads: 'I will declare to thee the reverend *gurus*. Those that read the Vedas and those that explain the meanings of the Vedas (*adhyetāraç ca vedān ye vedārthānāṁ ca bodhakāḥ*); those that explain the meaning of the codes on polity and a teller of right (*vaktā dharmān*); resolvers of doubt in regard to holy texts and Vedic words; a teller of observances; he that frees one from danger; he that gives or supplies one with sustenance, and he that causes good deeds to be done (or, v. l., prevents bad deeds); a brother-in-law; a mother's brother; an elder brother; a father; he that consecrates or performs other ceremonies— these are the people to be revered.'

On Bālhīka, as a type (Bactrian) see Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 742. 'One's own people, even if devoid of virtue, is better (than a strange people)' says the Rāmāyaṇa, vi. 66. 13 ff.—a sentiment strange to the Epic, and based on an extension of the *svadharmaḥ çreyān* theory of the castes (*nirguṇaḥ svajanaḥ çreyān*).

they asked, 'can this Dhritarāshtra now have a right to the kingdom, when he failed to obtain it before on account of his blindness?'[*] That these plans would have succeeded is to be inferred from the fact that the king seduced his nephews to a distant town and tried to burn them. The people, believing in their death, sank into passive acquiescence to the yoke. But again, far later in the drama, when this nephew has become king of a neighboring city, and returns to his paternal home, and is cheated out of the kingdom he has made, and banished into the woods by the wiles of Dhritarāshtra's son, even then the people cry out as before against the Kurus, and the priests become enraged and refuse to perform their duties.[†] In the earlier scene the king is supported in his schemes by his sons, and the ministers give no sign of disapproval. But for the people, he would not have found it necessary to send his nephew away, before putting his son on the throne. The question of legal right is but lightly touched upon. The people know that it is a disputed point which prince has a technical right to reign. They insist, however, on the moral superiority of their choice, and their right to choose. When the technical point comes up for discussion, Dhritarāshtra himself acknowledges that the nephew ought to have had the throne, and throws the whole blame on his son. His queen also says: 'it is the custom in our family that the crown shall descend from father to son;' and therefore argues that the son of the first actually reigning monarch had the right to succeed.[‡]

3. The last case under discussion is the election and ratification of the king by the people. The first case, of election, is shown by a literal translation of the passage describing how Kuru came to be king. Samvarana had a son called Kuru. He was a virtuous man. 'This Kuru all the people elected (sic) to the kingship, saying "he is a virtuous man."'[§]

Ratification by the people is shown in the following legendary instance. At his father's death, Janamejaya was a mere child. It was necessary that he should be installed as king (there were no objections raised). How was this accomplished? 'All the people inhabiting the city collected together, and this boy, the former king's son, they made king (sic); and this Janamejaya whom the people had declared king (sic) governed the kingdom with his councillors and priests.'[‖] As if to emphasize the fact,

---

[*] i. 141. 23 ff.

[†] ii. 80. 23–26; 81. 22.

[‡] *rājyaṁ kurūṇām anupūrvabhojyaṁ kramāgato naḥ kuladharma eṣaḥ*, v. 148. 30.

[§] (*kuruṁ*) *rājatve tam prajāḥ sarvādharmajña iti vavrire*: i. 94. 49.

[‖] *nṛpaṁ çiçuṁ tasya sutam pracakrire sametya puravāsino janāḥ, nṛpaṁ yam āhus tam janamejayaṁ janāḥ*, etc., i. 44. 6. The Purohita the statement is repeated. These may be nothing but legends, but they are certainly instructive. We may say that 'the people' imply priests in each case. But we see that, though the priests sometimes head the uprising, they are not always implied, and (as e. g. in the case of electing the Pāndu) they are not probably meant at all when 'the people' alone are spoken of. Even where the priests head the remonstrating people, we have the people as a whole protesting against the royal design; for the priests in these legends never undertake to face the king separately, but are represented as the exponents of the popular wish.

As to the disability arising from physical defects (debarring eunuchs, lepers, and even morally imperfect sons such as drunkards), although insisted upon in the law, and urged, when useful to urge it, in the Epic, it is plain that no such bar was felt to be infrangible in the early period; this is shown by Dhritarāshtra's succeeding his brother, and by the blind king (whose power is described in another story as usurped) being reinstated by the people. The usurper was slain by the 'councillors;' the people then insisted that the former king should be installed again as monarch, saying: 'Blind or not blind, this man shall be our king.' *

The royal laws especially recommend that a king shall 'make his son sure in the kingdom before his own death' (xii. 63. 19); and this is also enjoined in Manu's law-book. From the account of Yudhishthira's sudden leap to fame on being chosen crown-prince (i. 139. 1 ff.), and from the power of the subsequent heir, it seems as if the king, in thus installing his successor, virtually handed over to him most of the governing power. At the court of Dhritarāshtra, all is done by command of his son, who (as in the gambling scene) does not hesitate to insist that the old monarch shall revoke a sentence passed against his own (the crown-prince's) will. Nevertheless, when Yudhishthira finally obtains the kingdom, he makes a formal offer of submission to the old king. But practically the heir-apparent, when chosen crown-prince by his father, seems to have thereby become participator in the ruling power, and the old king sinks gradually into the background. Thus, for instance, Dhritarāshtra is still alive when his son is called the *rājā*.†

---

and councillors, in the verse preceding, attend only to the ceremonies appropriate to the decease of the old king. It is possible, however, that they are included in the subject (*puravāsinaḥ*) of the next verse. But they cannot exclude these (as they do in the Rāmāyaṇa).

* iii. 299. 5. This is professedly a legend.

† e. g. xv. 10. 20. The old king is a *rājaṛṣi* in ib. 12. 1 (where, by the way, Arjuna calls Bhīma 'his elder and his Guru:' a curious instance of the reverence for age, even when the eldest is not implied).

The king is, however, formally bid to banish the heir-apparent if he does anything worthy of such punishment; in connection with which rule this interesting tale is related: 'The son of Bāhu's son, Asamañjas, whose father was wise and good, had to be banished; for he caused the children in the city to be drowned. Therefore he was abandoned by his father, and was banished (*vivāsitaḥ*), even as Çvetaketu was abandoned by Uddālaka the seer, because he treated the priests badly' (xii. 57. 8–10). Whether the people compelled the prince's banishment is not stated.

6. *Royal Consecration.*—The royal consecration* was performed by a bath and baptism of water, as an accompaniment of a religious service. Suitable hymns and a Vedic ceremonial of course characterized the occasion. It is probable that in the simple event of a prince's succeeding a deceased father the repetition of Vedic verses, with the application of water at the hands of the priest, granted the consent of the people, was sufficient: such as, for instance, in the succession as described in the Rāmāyaṇa.† The assent of the people is obtained to the succession in the first place. After the king's death, the priests and council meet, decide which prince shall be called king, baptize him, and he becomes king. In the event of a king's recovering his lost kingdom, we have, as in Yudhishthira's case, more formality. The ceremony itself, as here described, is, however, essentially the same.‡ The king and Krishna sit together on two smooth jewelled-crowned thrones. Krishna rises, takes the consecrated horn, and pours water upon the king, proclaiming him at the same time 'lord of the earth.' This ceremony takes place in the midst of an assembled multitude of all the citizens, to whom gold and other gifts are given. The 'sacred vessel of consecration' (*ābhiṣecanikam bhāṇḍam*) is richly adorned with gems. Krishna gives next the word to the priest, who completes the consecration with suitable verses (xii. 40. 3 ff.).

This king has already long before passed through the *rājasūya*, or consecration of king as emperor.§ When the king has conquered enough to make himself think that he can assume to be emperor over his surrounding neighbors, reducing them thereby to the condition of tributaries, he must send out armies to verify his claim. All must be subdued and made to give tribute, though some are prevailed upon to own themselves inferior, and send tribute, without an actual conquest having taken place. Friends and relatives may be exempted from this necessity; and, at least in the case of relatives, the superiority of the claimant appears to be waived, as he is regarded as one of the family, and his honor is shared by those of the same blood, although ruling over a different city. If his claim to universal sovereignty is not successfully disputed, the ambitious king proceeds to proclaim himself lord of kings, or emperor, by holding high festival in his own honor, and making a feast, to which all decent people in his own state and the nobility from neighboring states are invited, the conquered kings appearing as underlings, bearing the promised tribute. A ceremony of consecration is gone through with similar to that above, and seems to be a ratification of the first performance, subsequent to a new war occurring some years after imperial power had been proclaimed, which obliged the once acknowledged emperor to reinforce his claim, and show that it was allowed. In the second consecration, we find a new assembly of kings; in the first, the king's and the emperor's brothers serve as attendants.*

---

* 'To be consecrated, to sacrifice, and to protect the people, are the chief duties of a king,' says the Rāmāyaṇa (ii. 113. 23).

† Accompanied of course by music, singers, etc.: R. ii. 12. 11.

‡ In the Rāmāyaṇa, the priestly council meet in the *sabhā* (assembly-hall), and the chief priest makes an address, explaining the death of the king and the necessity for having a new one consecrated. The elder son being banished, the younger must reign, for many ills ensue to a kingless people. The older councillors say 'even when the king was alive, we stood at your orders (*çāsane*); proceed, then, give your orders' (*sa naḥ çādhi*). After this the election is practically over, and there remains only the ceremony: R. ii. 69. 1 ff., 33; from 70. 1, the councillors are all priests, as usual in later legal assemblies (*pariṣad*).

§ A detailed account of this ceremony will be found in the seventh volume of the J. R. A. S., by Wilson, and in the second volume of Rājendralāla Mitra's Indo-Aryans.

Confirmative of imperial power is the formal rite preliminary to the famous horse-sacrifice. This ceremony as a religious rite absolves from sin; politically it proclaims the successful ends of the would-be emperor's desires. The *rājasūya* appears to be a very old, but naturally a rare rite; the horse-sacrifice consummates the same wish, but may also be employed merely as a religious rite by any king, without any such claim. The names of ten kings that have held a *rājasūya* are preserved in the Āitareya Brāhmaṇa (viii. 15); the consecration and horse-sacrifice after a year's wandering are reflected again in the late dramatic literature, and in the Purāṇas.[*]

---

* The first ceremony is described in ii. 32 ff. The account is here confused by a religious interpolation: apropos of Vishnu's divinity, the later redactors inserted (if the whole account be not a late insertion, which is improbable) the statement that an *arghya* was offered to Krishna. Probably the same water-ceremony as in an ordinary consecration took place. It is formally stated that slaves were not admitted to see the consecration; but, as the text shows, they were all invited if respectable. There is no reason for supposing them excluded; for an open-air ceremony was always girt with crowds of vulgar gazers, who were perhaps kept out of hearing of the Vedic verses. The later text kept them out as unsuitable to the gorgeousness of the occasion. See Wilson's view, and Rājendralāla Mitra's, *loc. cit.* ii. p. 14. Later still, a slave-officer even takes part at a consecration before the Purohita begins: compare Ag, P. 218. 18–20: *mṛṇmayena jaleno 'dak çūdrāmātyo 'bhiṣecayet.*

An interesting account of the horse-rite as a claim to empire, concluding in the sacrifice of the conquering steed, is given toward the end of the Epic story. The king that desired righteously to possess the whole earth, and after his victories to purify himself from all sin, in order to get the name of 'All-conqueror,' must loose a white horse, and send an army to accompany it. Wherever the horse went the army went. Of course, if the king was not able to support his claim, the different peoples into whose lands the steed wandered drove it off and beat the army back. If no resistance was offered, it was a sign of sovereignty to the king that had sent the horse forth. If resistance was offered, and the horse slain or the army defeated, that ended the matter. This part of the affair being symbolical of an already settled superiority on the part of an ambitious king or emperor, it made little difference how many men were sent out. They were only to serve as a type of the force behind. When Yudhishthira sends forth his steed, the army has, however, to contend with strange foes not yet ready to acknowledge the assumed supremacy. For a year the horse wandered, and was then led back to be sacrificed with appropriate ceremonies.[†] Such a sacrifice as this is considered so rare and great that it is equal to many more ordinary sacrifices.[‡] The initiatory consecration here takes place under full moon (*cāitryām pāurṇamāsyām*) in spring-time. The king's charioteer and the best 'understanders of horse-science,' together with the priests, select a pure horse,[§] which is freed after an ordinary propitiatory sacrifice, and allowed to stray. On the successful return of the horse, the *sthapatayaḥ* and other artizans (*çilpinaḥ*) announce the order of sacrifice to the king, who prepares everything. Bejewelled seats, pots, fans, etc., with golden posts of sacrifice, are made.[‖] After a number of cattle have been sacrificed, the horse is seized and killed; beside it sits the new All-conqueror's wife. According to rule they next drag out part of the entrails. This the king and his followers kiss (smell). The sixteen priests present burn the steed's limbs. Gifts are then bestowed on the priests, and on all the castes.* Thus the king verifies religiously his right got by the *rājasūya* to be an 'All-conqueror' or emperor, and is furthermore freed from the sin of taking human life involved in his wars. As described in the Epic, the whole ceremony is for two purposes: to make certain his earthly power, and to secure heaven hereafter.

---

[*] Compare the horse-sacrifice in the fourth act of Utt. R. Carita; the inauguration-scene in the last act of Vikramorvaçī; and the horse sent out for a year, guarded by a boy and a hundred *rājputs*, in the fifth act of Mālavikāgnimitra, where the steed is to be brought home in a year (*upāvartanīya*, v. 15). See also Ag. P. 219 (the northern Kurus protect the king in consecration, 54); and Vāyu P. ii. 26. 148: *açvaṁ vicārayāmāsa vājimedhāya dīkṣitaḥ*.

[†] It does not lie in my present purpose to describe in detail the religious rites at these ceremonies.

[‡] xiv. 71. 15; ib. 72. 4 ff. But of course the original rite was less purificatory than ambitious.

[§] *medhyam açvam*; the *açvavidyā* is the same as *hayaçikṣā*, in ib. 79. 17.

[‖] *yūpāḥ*; six of *bilva*, *khadira*, and *palāça* wood, two of *devadāru*, one of *çleṣmātaka*, etc. The posts were therefore gilded.

I have here noted only the consecration by sprinkling. A bathing ceremony is also described in the Epic, but the formal *nīrājana* is not a part of the ceremony. This rite, according to the later usage alluded to in the Harivança and fully described in the Bṛhat Saṁhitā and the Puranic literature, consists in sprinkling the king, his steeds, elephants, etc., even the arms being included.† But the wife shares the sprinkling in the Epic (ii. 67. 30).

7. *The Assembly and Council.*—The earliest assembly for adjusting political affairs in Aryan India was the clan-assembly, called *sabhā* (compare German *Sippe*). In the legal literature, the *sabhā* is a court or judicial assembly presided over by the king as chief judge, and only the councillors, judges, and police officers take part as men of authority over witnesses and accused.‡ In the Epic we find the *sabhā* to be an assembly of any sort. It may be a judicial one, a court of law; it may be a royal one, the king's court; it may be a social gathering for pleasure; and finally it may, in its older meaning, be a political assembly. In such a case as that mentioned above, where the people met 'in assemblies' to discuss political matters, we may perhaps see a trace of the original function of the people's assembly, though such a meeting had, of course, long since ceased to be what the *sabhā* had been—a village assembly for counsel—and corresponds neither to the regular *sabhā* of old nor to the antique state council in which the king took part (*samiti*), the latter having now become a meeting of the nobles and king.

---

* Gifts as usual of jewels, umbrellas, etc. 'A king ought to be generous,' it is naïvely remarked here, 'for priests love money:' *brāhmaṇā hi dhanārthinaḥ.* In regard to these points, the divison of spoils, and the gifts to the people, compare xiv. 85. 25 ff.; 88. 27 ff.; 89. 4 ff.

† Compare Varāh. B. S. 48; Ag. P. 267, *vidhiḥ;* see P. W.; add Ag. P. 238. 32 (cf. K. Nīt. 4. 66) *nīrājitahayadvipaḥ;* ib. 268. 38–39: *vatsare rājño 'bhiṣekaḥ kartavyaḥ purodhasā*, with the 'victory-words' to horse, sword, etc., in the following; compare also ib. 218. 3 ff. The consecration in the Rāmāyaṇa is described in vi. 112. 76 ff.

‡ The *pariṣad* was here a priestly council of ten members, convened to settle rules of that order. Compare Vās. iii. 20; M. xii. 111.

A legal bon-mot on the *sabhā*, preserved in the Epic and law alike, points to the use of the term as a judicial assembly such as the law-books know: 'that is no assembly where there are no elders; those are not elders who do not declare the law.'[*] As a general term for a convivial assembly, it is used in the (title of the) second book of the Epic: so in the Rig-veda (x. 34. 6), describing a like scene of gambling; and it is convertible with *saṁsad*, with which in the Epic it is connected. So the *sabhāsad* 'frequenter of assembly' is in the Epic merely a courtier, one of the nobles in the king's court (as in ii. 78. 3); while the *sabhāstāra* seems to be only one who is at the court, or a lower officer in the position of dice-master. Thus Yudhishthira takes the part of a gambler, and goes disguised to Virāṭa's court. He is then a *sabhāstāra* (iv. i. 24); but when the native courtiers give judgment on Drāupadī, they are called *sabhāsadaḥ*. I do not know whether a difference can be maintained here, as Yudhishthira becomes practically a courtier playing dice with the king—though, to be sure, very ignominiously treated. In the Rāmāyaṇa, the *sabhāsadaḥ* are simply courtiers attending an assembly. They sit together, and rise respectfully at the instance of the chief-priest.[†] On the other hand, as the popular 'assembly' became the kingly 'court' (*rājasamiti*), so the duties of that assembly became transferred to the 'councillors' or private ministers of the king, some account of whom I have given above in treating of the military officers of the realm. It would, however, be unjust to the importance of the subject in the eyes of the Epic writers were we to pass over without more complete examination the closer relations existing between the king and his advisers.

---

[*] *na sā sabhā yatra na santi vṛddhā na te vṛddhā ye na vadanti dharmaṁ*; here *vṛddhāḥ* is a pun on *vadanti dharmam*; *sabhā*, on *santi vṛddhāḥ*: v. 35. 58. The use of *vṛddha* is illustrated by v. 5. 5 (cf. *viçiṣṭa*, ib. 6. 3): *bhavān vṛddhatamo rājñāṁ vayasā ca çrutena ca*, 'eldest (most advanced) art thou in age and learning.'

[†] R. ii. 4. 24. It is, however, difficult to establish any fixed meaning for the *sabhā* here. It may be a council of 'advisers,' where the king sits, to which and to see whom the people are not admitted formally, but crowd out of curiosity (R. ii. 82. 11); or it may comprise all the Aryans (*āryajana*, *rājaprakṛtayaḥ*), and be synonymous, in the Epic sense, with *pariṣad*, an assembly where the priest addresses the king and ministers: that is, a state council of king and upper castes (R. ii. 88. 1–2, 23). Compare R. ii. 114. 1, where the king speaks 'in the midst of the assembly' (*madhye pariṣadaḥ*, i. e. *sabhāyāḥ*), and ib. 113. But even this *pariṣad* may include the 'townfolk' or elders of the city (*pāurajanapadāḥ*), along with the councillors (*mantriṇaḥ*), ii. 121. 12. Exactly similar to this is the nomenclature in Mbh. xvi. 3. 17, where a kingly assembly is held, and the injury to Bhūriçravas is discussed *pariṣado madhye*; alongside of ib. 7. 7, where one wishes to see the *amātyas* at once, and rushes into the *sabhā*, and *tam āsanagataṁ tatra sarvāḥ prakṛtayas tathā, brāhmaṇā nāigamās tatra parivāryo 'patasthire* ib. 8).

Here we have perhaps the most striking antithesis between legend and history. The heroes of the Mahābhārata are not what they (by later interpolations) are exhorted to be. They act from their own wishes, not from ministerial advice. They consult their brothers and friends, not their priestly advisers. Bhīshma, Vidura, and Droṇa are great sages, and high ministers of the king; but the two first are relatives, and of the warrior-caste; and the last is an ally and a fighting priest; if the figment of priesthood be closely examined, perhaps not a priest at all.* Bhīshma, the sage, leads the army, and long before had seized three girls in Kāçī and fought for their possession with all contestants.† Kanika and Jābāli are in themselves rarities, and the former is not necessarily a priest. The king of Indraprastha has as little to do with ministerial or priestly advice as his uncle in Hastina. When resolved to imperil his kingdom, he does so because he wills it. He seeks no advice from a priest. Dhāumya's name is familiar only as religious officiator, yet he is the chief priest. The king does not employ him as councillor, nor has he an officer's place of any sort till left in charge of the city with Yuyutsu in the late fifteenth book (see above). The king's haughty cousin consults the priests as to the best manner of raising a required sum of money, but not otherwise. Resolving on war, the kings and allies, both of Pāndus and of Kurus, consult together, and, though priests are present, with themselves alone (v. 1 and 148–150). All is practically done by a court of nobles and princes. Duryodhana, being resolved on war, goes against his will to hear the consultation, and retires as determined as before, although the advice of the council is against his wish. Moreover, in this council the real priests are mere figures. When the prince retired, all those that had opposed his measures followed him, 'resolved to die for him.' The council is military.‡ The meaning is clear. The assembly of the people had become an assembly of nobles. The military power of the people had quite become the possession of the king. In all public matters appertaining to the story itself, the priests are as good as silent, and the people are suppressed. It is only in such older legends as are related above, and told in our story as 'ancient tales,' that the power of the people seems to linger, and then not in military but in civil matters.* On the other hand, the third period, represented by the late didactic parts of the Epic, is one when the priests assume the right to be the king's advisers in all particulars. A cabinet council of the greatest secrecy is always recommended. But in the assembly of nobles, as shown in the history, no secrecy is thought of. We have thus three diplomatic stages reflected in our poem: the popular assembly, already restricted to protestation in civil matters; the public aristocratic assembly on war matters; the private† priestly council on all matters.

---

* Compare J. T. Wheeler, History of India, i. 77.

† Bhīshma is, as we see him, more warrior than sage. Compare his exploit with the three girls (i. 102. 3 ff.) He becomes later the saint and sage, and perhaps is wholly a later interpolation.

† So in the Rāmāyaṇa, just before the battle begins, Rāvaṇa enters the *sabhā* for a hasty deliberation; then, coming out with his *sacivas*, a suite of ministers, makes a speech and gives his final orders at once: 'quick with the drum, lead the forces up, there is no time for delay.' The *sabhā* here is simply an assembly for military deliberation (R. vi. 8. 42–45); the *sacivāḥ* may be nothing more than comites in battle (as in R. vi. 21. 41 . That is to say, *saciva* was a minister or helper of any sort, *sabhā* was any assembly.

The last of these councils is most fully illustrated, of course, owing to the priestly interpolation; but we must bear in mind that the council of priests is only didactically urged, and is not a part of the story. Doubtless the king in the last period of the Epic consulted (on military as well as civil and spiritual affairs) chiefly with his priestly prime minister. The important evidence of the Epic story is negative. The plans for war are conducted and completed without asking the advice of priests. Even Bhīshma is regarded as an elder warrior, not as a priest, when heard in the assembly; and the Pāndus consult only their allies. The growth of the 'priestly council' will be seen in the next paragraph.

8. *The Royal Purohita and the Priestly power.*—Before examining the intimate connection between king and priest, assumed (by the priest) as necessary for the welfare of the state, it may be well to remind ourselves that a number of cases are recorded of early antagonism between the warrior and

---

* There is an interesting example of this in the speech made by king Drupada's ambassador to the Kurus. He is exhorted to appeal to the princes and to the generals, and to represent to the elders the 'family law' as infringed. When he arrives, however, the speech is made only in presence of the royal family and leaders of the army (v. 6. 15: 20. 2: *sarvasenāpraṇetṝṇām madhye vākyam uvāca ha*). This is in the first instance a reminiscence of the older 'assembly,' and the elders are those of the town inhabitants; as is expressly stated in a proposed embassy mentioned for the same purpose on the part of the Pāndus, who urge that an ambassador shall be sent to declare the matter in the presence of the court and the assembled elders of the town (*pāureṣu vṛddheṣu ca samāgateṣu*), v. 2. 7. In i. 221. 39 'citizens' (*pāurāḥ*) are distinguished from priests.

† Absolute secrecy in council is a late practice, but as a rule is strongly urged. The king should go to the house-top or a hill-top when he consults with his ministers, who according to the text may live in the palace, but according to the details of the story have separate abodes. Some forms of the rule specify 'a secret chamber' as the place for council (xii. 83. 57; 80. 23; v. 38. 17 ff., etc.). See above.

priestly castes.[*] It is probably because the priest had in mind the earlier independence of the king that he, even in the latest period, insists so strongly on the necessity of reciprocal support. For in that latest period no orthodox king would have dared to resist the representative of the spiritual power. Let us now see what were the claims of the full-fledged priest in relation to his sovereign's councils.

'A king's power is five-fold,' says the pedant priest: 'brute-force, the first; second, that derived from his ministers; third, from his wealth; fourth, from his descent; fifth, the best, wherein all lie, wisdom.'[†] And this wisdom is the hoard of the priests. 'The king should not eat alone, nor think about things alone, nor walk alone, nor be awake alone' (v. 33. 46). He should never part from his advisers, but do in the ideal state as is recorded in a legend of the first book, where, when the king went into the wood, he was accompanied by all his ministers and the family-priest.'[‡] At this period the king depends on the advice of his ministers and the accounts of his spies.[§] For council, as for war, let him appoint officers (xii. 91.

---

[*] Viçvāmitra and Vasishtha; Kritavīrya's sons, etc. This subject is discussed by Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 703 ff. The Epic has three kings that are especially noted as having had contentions with the priests: Viçvāmitra, Nahusha, and Purūravas. The last, for example, 'made war on the priests, and robbed them of their jewels' (i. 75. 20). Manu and the Harivança add among others Vena; but the former does not include Purūravas, who was in older texts reckoned a good king. Compare Muir, Sanskrit Texts, i. 296 ff., with M. vii. 41: cf. Mbh. xii. 60. 39.

[†] *yad balānām balaṁ çreṣṭhaṁ tat prajñābalam ucyate:* v. 37. 52 ff.; 55; cf. ib. 39. 70: *tapo balaṁ tāpasānām brahma brahmavidām balam,* etc., repeated in 34. 75, with the addition *rājñāṁ daṇḍavidhir balam, çuçrūṣā tu balaṁ strīṇām* (*daṇḍa* here as in iii. 150. 32, *daṇḍanītim ṛte nirmaryādam idam bhavet* 'a system of punishment is necessary to the conservation of law'). Compare i. 175. 29, 'a warrior's power is anger; a priest's is patience;' although in ib. 45–46 such warrior-power is scorned: *dhig balaṁ kṣatriyabalam brahmatejo balam balam, tapa eva param balam,* 'fie on a warrior's power; the priest's power is the only true power.'

[‡] *sāmātyaḥ . . purohitasahāyaç ca:* i. 70. 35.

[§] Of these latter the country was full. 'A king may learn wisdom from a fool, as one gets gold from a rock, . . and should glean information from spies, as a gleaner gets ears of corn' (v. 34. 32). They are employed in town and country. 'Surrounded by good ministers, the king governs with his rod (*çāsti daṇḍena*, metaphorical), and employs spies both in every district and every fort' (iii. 150. 37, 38 ff.; cf. 42, 43). These spies are partly military, partly civil. They are the king's very eyes; for 'cows see by smell, priests by knowledge, kings by spies' (v. 34. 34: compare the verses in the last act of Mṛcchakaṭikā). Even the ministers he must have watched by spies: 'to guard against conspiracy, let him have old houses and such places carefully watched' (xii. 58. 7; cf. 58. 10; 69. 1 ff.). Specially recommended as dangerous are the assemblies (*samāgama*) of priests, four-crossroads, public assemblies, market places, etc. Compare also i. 140. 63; v. 192, 62, where the spies are disguised as beggars and blind men (M. ix. 364).

29), since the voice-power (*vāgbalam:* v. 144. 21) of the priest is as important as the army-power. Everything and everybody must now 'stand under the order of the priests' (*çāsane:* i. 140. 54), and worship them, as they have taught the people to do for themselves and the king.*

The kings themselves recognize the objective point of their priests' endeavors: 'All priests have spent their strength to acquire fame, . . become followers of teachers just in order to win glory' (i. 124. 12–13). The Guru or teacher of holy knowledge was always to be venerated, and, being always a priest, must still have had an intellectual hold upon the king's mind. In ordinary cases, a pupil may not only do nothing that the Guru forbids, but may not do anything unless this teacher commands it (i. 161. 18); and though with royal pupils the teacher may well have been on his guard, yet, as legends relate, neither he nor the ordinary priest hesitated to turn their wrath against the royal house on trifling occasions. The morality of Kanika is of a very utilitarian sort. Power, in the teaching of this adviser. is the aim of life. What is virtue? 'A hook to reap fruit with' (i. 140. 20: *aṅkuçaṁ çāucam ity āhuḥ*). 'The order given even by a sinful priest is good' (ib. 54). It is pleasant to note, however, that such advice is from the moral point of view opposed to the general tone of priestly doctrine, as are some of the practical rules in the same passage.†

---

* The king also now becomes *divus:* compare *janako janadevas tu mithilāyāṁ janādhipaḥ* (xii. 218. 3; 219. 1). He is the incorporate god of right and law (i. 113. 24; 180. 9 ff. and 4; 49. 8). His touch is like fire; one must endure all that he does (iii. 41. 20; i. 41. 23–24; iii. 161. 11). The king as divinity is often spoken of in a Homeric way: 'serve the king like a god,' *devavat*, ϑεὸν ὣς τιμήσουσιν (iv. 4. 22; xiv. 63. 24). With the identification of Dharma and king, cf. Manu, vii. 18 and our text again (Rājā = Daṇḍaḥ) xii. 15. 34 (the personified punishment reminds us of the Eumenides: 'He wanders about, splitting, chopping, causing bursting, causing rending, causing slaying, pursuing; thus wanders even the god, punishment,' xii. 121. 19). Godlike characteristics of a good king are given in i. 64. 13 ff.; he is identified with the creator, i. 49. 10; 'like the moon,' or 'is the moon,' is a common comparison, i. 222. 9; ib. 49. 12; which, with the Indra comparison, may have given rise to the ultimate identification of the king with all the divinities, as in iii. 185. 26–30; xii. 68. 10 ff., 40 = M. vii. 8, etc., 40 ff., all the gods; 139. 103 ff., father, mother, *guru*, and all the gods. Compare R. ii. 122. 17 ff., and R. ii. 111. 4: *rājānam mānuşam āhur devas tvaṁ sammato mama, yasya dharmārthasahitaṁ vṛttam āhur amānuṣam.* The deification thus portrayed was the king's reward for his exalting of the priest. For the priest did not scruple to deify the king so long as he could himself maintain the claim of being 'the god of the gods:' xiii. 152. 16 (M. ix. 315 ff.; Ag. P. 225. 16, 18 ff.).

† The whole chapter is an interesting one; part of it is a reflex from the law: thus, 8 = M. vii. 105, and 14 = M. vii. 106. Other advice given is that no mercy should be shown to refugees (*çaraṇāgata*). Verse 52 recommends that the Guru himself be killed if he be a traitor (usually only banished). Bribery. poison. and witchcraft are, further,

That a priest may be killed is in direct contradiction to the law. There a priest may on no account be slain, unless he tries (with a weapon) to kill another man. If that other then slay him in self-defense, it is pardonable. But the Epic gives, surely, even in late passages, a contradictory sentiment. A recreant priest may always be slain if he takes to fighting,[*] and Uçanas says that even a priest who draws on you may be killed with impunity, for the meed of wrath is wrath;[†] but otherwise he ought, as highest punishment, to be banished.[‡] In a chapter devoted to the life of the state officials it is said: 'The officer that lives at court shall not dress like the king; he shall not multiply royal edicts; he shall not when officially employed appropriate royal property; by so doing he incurs imprisonment or death' (iv. 4. 48 ff.). The priest is not expressly mentioned here, but would be implied, except we allow the general rule against killing to take precedence.[§]

The true basis of kingly power is the priest's power; of priestly power, the king's power. Their union is perfection. This, in a word, is the one view taken by the later writers: or, we may say, by the didactic writing even of ancient times; for the acts of the Epic descriptions are of older tone than the words of earlier homilies.[‖]

---

recommended against enemies, while false devotees and heretics are to be employed as spies. Note here the didactic tone also: 'let thy speech be dull, let thy heart be as a razor'; 'the house of one who has been executed is to be destroyed by fire'; 'the beginning is the attainment of the fruit' (=ἀρχὴ ἥμισυ παντός, *phalārtho 'yaṁ samārambhaḥ*, 21).

[*] *sa vadhyaḥ*, vii. 160. 38.

[†] xii. 56. 29–30; in ib. 34. 18 attributed to Veda: cf. Vās. iii. 16; B. i. 10 18. 12–13; etc.

[‡] ib. 56. 31–34: *viprasya viṣayānte visarjanaṁ vidhīyate na çārīraṁ daṇḍam eṣāṁ kadācana* (*klībatvam ārṣam*, N.).

[§] The best passage forbidding a priest's execution is found in v. 82. 16 ff., where it is also stated that a warrior may be executed by royal order (the following description of the courtier, *amlāno balavāñ chūraḥ . . satyavādī mṛdur dāntaḥ*, applies to the warrior). No one unacquainted with Revelation (holy scripture) ought to be admitted to the king's formal council (v. 38. 24). The ninth act of the Mṛcchakaṭikā has an amusing illustration of the difference in opinion in regard to killing a priest. The rule is quoted that a priest, as it is forbidden by Manu, ought not to be 'killed'; the Brahman is then carried out to be impaled!

[‖] *ubhayam eva brahma kṣatraṁ cā 'varundhe rājā sann ṛṣir bhava(ti) ya evaṁ veda* (Jāiminīya-Brāhmaṇa, Burnell's MS., p. 562). *Saṁsṛṣṭam brahmaṇā kṣatraṁ kṣatreṇa brahma saṁhitam* (perfection), i. 81. 19; compare i. 75. 14: 'born of Manu were the priest, the warrior, and other men; then united the priestly with a warrior power': compare also iii 185. 25; xiii. 59. 24, 36. The oft-found allusion to the warrior as born of the priestly caste is explained by the legend that, when the earth had lost all her warriors in war, the priests united with the women of the warrior-caste and recreated warriors (i. 104. 5; 64. 5; vii. 70. 20).

When, however, distinction is instituted, the priest is best of all: 'From one divine body came the four castes; separate are their duties; separate their purifications; of these the priestly caste is best' (i. 81. 20). 'The king,' says the priest, 'is destroyed if he turn against the priest'; but the same was wise enough to say: 'there are three men that possess the earth, a warrior, a wise man, and a courtier'; and he made it his task to be both the wise man and the courtier, and so keep a double hold of earth.*

Especially sacred are always three priests: the Guru who has taught the king his 'sacred learning,' and whom we see, e. g. in the Mudrārākṣasa, as the venerable minister that supercedes the king himself in administering the kingdom; the sacrificial priest; and the family-priest (though the first and last may be identical). Now the later didactic Epic endeavors not only to insist on the time-worn rule of immunity for these sacred characters, but also to make the Guru and the family-priest the controllers of the king's mind and council.† Such a priest should be in authority. He should be as important as all the other ministers put together. As to punishing him, there are certain men infatuated enough to affect the Çaṅkha-Likhita school, and say a bad priest ought to be slain; but let not a king slay such a priest 'even if a great number of villages demand it'; even to revile him is a sort of treason (*pāiçunam*); those that demand punishment after the Çaṅkha-Likhiṭa model (summary retaliation for slight offenses) are actuated by selfish motive; there is no Vedic authority for such a thing.‡

Such is the Epic view, as the later priests laid it down. And yet how different not only from the whole tone of the free early tale,§ but from the moral character of most of the priests themselves. For, except for the court-priests, the caste was one of pious if foolish, humble if narrow men. The hermitage produced those whose moral uprightness and noble pride in learning and literature was imitated, and falsely stamped as genuine nobility of soul, by those whose servile life led only to desire of upward growth in material prosperity. What braver and morally loftier words could we seek than those of the priest (?) Mātanga: 'Press only up; bend not; for upward striving alone is manliness: break even; but bend not.'[*]

---

* v. 15. 34=M. ix. 321; so v. 38. 13. Compare i. 137. 12; xii. 78. 21 ff. The last quotation ends *yaç ca jānāti sevitum*—reference lost.

† The person usually mentioned is the Purohita or family priest, who may or may not have been the Guru or tutor of his youth, but who is ex officio his Guru or venerable advisor κατ' ἐξοχήν. when an appointed or inherited minister.

‡ xii. 132. 10 ff. The twenty-third section of the same book gives the reason of those that are *Çaṅkha-Likhitapriyāḥ* in a tale—extremists in their view of punishment.

§ It is this early tone that strengthens belief in the great antiquity of the original poem over against the acknowledged lateness of huge portions of the present Epic. The priest does not here represent the advance made even in the Brahmanic period by his caste: for there also we find the priest not only sharing the power with the king (*ubhe vīrye*). but superior. 'The king that is weaker than his (Brahman) priest is stronger than his foes,' is the epitome of this view (both from the Çatapatha Br., Weber, *Ind. St.* x. 27. 30). In the last, *abalīyān* evidently implies 'assumes less authority' (v. 4. 4. 15).

Such words as these were caricatured by the court priest's worldly mind to mean 'get as high up as you can in the world; get as much wealth, as high a social position, as possible; assert yourself as superior to everyone else.'

We have found negative evidence that the priest is not active in state-council except in didactic portions of the Epic. What does this didactic portion teach in regard to the chief-priest especially? Practically, the chief of the king's councillors, though private in office, stands the Purohita or family-priest. The king is advised to have ministers. He must have a Purohita. 'The king must have a good family-priest; this man must not only be just and upright, but he must understand the principles of desire and gain, and know the true essence of things.'[†]

Moreover, besides being conversant with sacred literature and possessed of moral virtues, this priest, 'in order to secure to the king victory and heaven,' must be eloquent and skillful, 'for his use is to gain (for the king) gain as yet ungot, and to guard what has been already got.'[‡] For this purpose a king is directed to get his family-priest, and abide by his judgment. Observe his extended duties and simultaneous power. He became the confidant, the adviser of the king naturally. He must be so, said the later priest.[§] Thence the transfer to the whole caste: 'A kingdom devoid of priests to help the king will never conquer the earth through mere bravery';* and, again: 'even a debauched king, if he put a priest at the head of affairs, will conquer mortal and spiritual enemies; therefore let kings employ family-priests in every act, if they wish to obtain happiness from it' (i. 170. 72 ff.). In fact, the knight is only a sham-hero; 'the one and only hero is the wise man' (i. 232. 3); and 'the way in which the warrior obtained his power was by the priest's deputing it'; for it was originally the latter's.†

---

[*] This verse, attributed by N. to Mātanga in v. 127. 19–20, is given in ib. 134. 39 to 'the ancients,' i. e. a priestly proverb. In the original ('break at the knotted joints'), the metaphor is from the bamboo. Its application to a warrior (where 'bend to the priest' is added) is forced, though the warrior has his own oft-repeated verse, 'manliness I deem the highest thing': xii. 56. 15.

[†] The quotation is from i. 174. 14–15; the Purohita is insisted on, and required to be an astrologist and prognosticator in ii. 5. 40 ff. Compare xii. 72. 1, where he is to 'guard the good and suppress the bad,' etc.; and, to give pre-Epic authority, Ait. Br. viii. 24 (*puro dadhīta*); G. xi. 12: Vās. xix.3.

[‡] Compare iii. 26. 16 ff., and 11–14: 'the sight of the priest, the strength of the warrior—each is unequalled; the world is at peace when these are much together; then, to gain what is yet ungotten and to increase what is gotten already, let a king seek knowledge among the priests.' We have the 'far sight of the priest' again in iii. 29. 16.

[§] It is as necessary that the Purohita should know the art of polity (*daṇḍanīti*) as that he should know the Veda. Compare e. g. Ag. P. 238. 16.

But further, the assumption of a spiritual power greater than the physical might of the king is always maintained. The priest can destroy the realm by his magical power and through sacrifice: 'an archer's arrow kills but one; the dart of knowledge slays a realm'; 'neglect kills a cow, a (neglected) priest, when angered, kills a realm.'‡ The combination of priestly and knightly knowledge in Droṇa is a combination of which it is said 'that is a union of which we have never heard in anyone before.'§

The priest will always support the king if the latter does as the former wishes, and especially if he pays him sufficiently. There was an unfortunate king who tried to compel the priests to do as they ought in the matter of sacrificing; he tried to compel them by his modesty, by his mildness, by his generosity. He failed. His gifts were not large enough (i. 223. 25). It is worth while to complete the picture of these latter-day saints, and show the real aim of the priestly courtiers. Cows and, later, land, the priest always covets. He demands them as a sacrificial fee. They are the key to heaven for the king. 'When the king dies, if he expects to gain future happiness, he had better bequeath considerable land to the priests.'‖ 'By giving land and cows to the priests a king is freed from all sin; whatever sins a king commits in acquiring new realms, he casts them all off if he makes sacrifice and large gifts to the priests'

---

* i. 170, 75–80: compare the character of the Purohita, and the necessity for his being honored, in xii. 73. 5 ff.; and the royal *ṛtvij* in xii. 79. 1 ff.

† iii. 185. 29: power that is now concealed in the 'buttery heart of the priest' as compared with his razor-like voice; while the knight's voice is buttery and his heart a knife, i. 3. 123.

‡ v. 40. 8; cf. ib. 33. 43; in 45, *mantraviplava* does the same. Those that hate the priests (the three castes are mentioned) become demons when they die (*rākṣasāḥ*), ix. 43. 22. The priest was not to sit on the same seat with a warrior: 'only these may sit down together: a father and his son; a priest with a priest; a warrior with a warrior' (v. 35. 16).

§ *nāi 'tat samastam ubhayaṁ kasmiṅç cid anuçuçruma*, iv. 51. 9: *kṛtāstratvam* and *brahmavedaḥ* are meant.

‖ vii. 110. 50. Compare (xii. 12. 30) *grāmān janapadāṅç cāi 'va kṣetrāṇi ca gṛhāṇi ca, apradāya dvijātibhyaḥ* . . . (beside horses and cattle) *vayaṁ te rājakalayo bhaviṣyāmaḥ* (29: *açaraṇyaḥ prajānāṁ yaḥ sa rājā kalir ucyate*); on the other hand, *yo naḥ çaraṇadaḥ* . . . *bhavet* is a synonym of king, R. vi. 74. 41.

(iii. 33. 78, 79). In the latest portion it is pitiful to see the degradation of the priest. He grovels for gifts.* His rapacity breaks every barrier that morality, religion, and philosophy had striven to raise between his soul and the outer world. He becomes a mere *periculorum præmiorumque ostentator.*†

Terrible tales are told of those that dared to brave the priestly power; but even in the stories most redounding to priestly glory there lies a germ of ancient contempt for the priest.

---

* The priest's attitude toward God is the same as toward the king: he looks on the divinity mainly as a means of wealth. In Ag. P. 121. 52 we find a characteristic verse illustrating this: *oṁ dhanadāya sarvadhaneçāya dehi me dhanaṁ svāhā.*

† The claim of the priest to higher spiritual power, ending in the assumption of divinity, precedes the growing claims of gifts. The one reached its highest point while the other was still behind its complete development. As early as the Brāhmaṇas the priests are deified, but the last extravagance of gift-claiming is to be found in the latest portion of the Epic. The priest in view of his own claim would even debar the king from receiving gifts. The priest stands in place of the fire-god: therefore it is the same as if one made offering to the god when the king gives gold to the priests (xiii. 85. 147–8). This is but one verse in a shameless chapter. The original duty (as preserved in xiii. 61. 4 ff.) is for the king to give the priest sustenance; but it is extended to wealth of every sort; for the king's 'horrible deeds' (*rāudraṁ karma*: compare *āsurabhāva*, used of warriors) may be cleansed by sacrifice and gifts to the priests: 'the king is made pure if he sacrifice with rich sacrifice,' and 'gifts to a priest are better than sacrifice.' It is said that priests should not take from a bad king; but greed denies it; 'they may take even from a bad king' (ib. and 62. 11). Priests are of such sort that neither gods nor men can prevail against them; and, if not honored, they would make new gods and destroy the old (the parallel in Manu shows again the fact I pointed out in another essay, that the latter belongs to the period of this Parvan); all the mixed castes have become so through disregard of priests (33. 1 ff., 21; 35. 18–21; 47. 42, the priests are the gods of the gods). Cf. with this also 31. 34, and 62. 92: *nā 'sti bhūmisāmaṁ dānam*, etc., as in the Inscriptions. In the priests' gifts it is noted that the king should not give to an *apātra*, and not refuse a *pātra*; these are two possible errors in giving (xii. 26. 31) that destroy its worth. To confiscate a priest's property, or 'steal it,' brings down another imprecation often found on the land-grants in Inscriptions (the thief goes to thirty hells, and lives on his own dung, xiii. 101. 11 ff.). A list of fit recipients is given in xiii. 23. 33 ff.: cf. 22. 19 ff.–23. In xii. 321. 143 there is a story of a king who gave away so much to the priests that he broke his treasury; 'and he became a miserable wretch.' On the whole, there is a marked difference between the priest of this book and of the fifth, at least in impudence. Cf. the modesty of v. 33. 15 ff.; 35. 73, etc. It is only in a sort of spiritual exaltation that we find in the late portions a distinct abnegation of worldly benefits, in order to a proper 'deliverance,' and find that the receipt of presents is sinful, 'since the silkworm is destroyed by what it feeds upon;' where one is advised even to give up 'truth and falsehood,' and devote himself wholly to *nirvāṇa* (xii. 330. 29; 332. 44; 340. 60: a passage where the *ka* hymn is imitated; *ahiṅsā* is the rule of sacrifice; and Brahmaism is united with Vishnuism, 335. 4; 338. 4 ff.; 340. 115. 125; a pure *purāṇa* section, 340. 123; 348. 78; but even here gifts come again to their right).

The might of king Viçvāmitra availed little against the power of the priest Vasishtha; but the fact that the king in the story goes to the priest and demands his beloved Nandinī and (when she is refused) threatens, saying, 'If you do not give me Nandinī I shall not abandon the character of a warrior, but take her by force,' shows if anything disdain for the priest. So, too, in the Nahusha tale. His was an awful fate, because 'he harnessed the seers like horses' and made them drag him, exclaiming exultantly: 'No man of little power is he who makes the sages his steeds;' but that a legend survives to show that a king did such a thing is more useful than his legendary fate.* The king becomes so thoroughly docile to the priest in the ideal world of what should be (a great part of the Epic) that he receives the same approving epithet bestowed upon a well-trained horse or elephant, and is termed 'obedient' or 'governed.'† Summarizing priestly functions as enjoined by the later Epic, we may cite the following: '(Priests) learned in revelation should be employed by the king in legal and business affairs (*vyavahāreṣu dharmeṣu*); one man cannot be trusted to control such matters; let the king, therefore, employ the learned priests (to see to these things); for a king is called "ungoverned," and sins, if he does not properly guard his subjects' interests, and claims too much from them, etc.; since he takes on himself the sins committed by his ill-protected people.'‡

---

* Nahusha is mentioned by Manu also as an 'unruly king' (vii. 41). The Epic story is given in v. 15 ff.; and in i. 75. 29 it is added that he was a powerful monarch, who conquered the barbarian hordes, and made the seers pay taxes as well as harnessed them 'like cattle.' The seers (*muni, ṛṣi*) were probably the priests of his day. The oft-repeated Vasishtha story is told in i. 175; the quotation above verse 20, etymology being subverted to the purpose of the tale, *indriyāṇāṁ vaçakaro vasiṣṭha iti co 'cyate* (174. 6 (b) B. omitted in C. 6639 = 6 (a) and 7). The *vāsiṣṭham ākhyānam purāṇam* in regard to the famous *vāiraṁ viçvāmitravasiṣṭhayoḥ* closes as usual: (48) *brāhmaṇatvam avāptavān apibac ca tataḥ somam indreṇa saha.* The king became a priest. Such interchange of caste is not unique. 'A priest who has been a king' (*rājarṣi*) is several times alluded to. Compare *muniputrāu dhanurdharāu* in xiii. 6. 33, 'priests' sons bearing bows;' and see the appendix to this section.

† v. 34. 12: compare ib. 39. 43; also M. vii. 39–40. The same expression is used of the people when properly subjugated by the king, xii. 131. 13. The Rāmāyaṇa remarks that the priest might desert the king if the latter did not obey him, just as Ricika did Çunahcepa (R. ii. 116. 10), implying of course a melancholy fate. *Vinaya* is used also in R. of a son's obedience to his mother (ii. 17. 10), but also of restraint imposed by wisdom: *rāmo vidyāvinītaç ca vinetā ca parān raṇe* (R. v. 32. 7; in 9, *vedavinītaḥ*, 'by wisdom governed and governing all in war'). Later still, compare e. g. Ag. P. 224. 21: *naçyed avinayād rājā rājyaṁ ca vinayāl labhet*; also ib. 237. 3.

‡ xii. 24. 18 ff. The victories of a king depend on the advice of the priest properly followed, R. ii. 109. 11; he must attend to the words of the diviners and astrologers (G. xi. 15). The privy councillors in R.

What the effect of this yielding to the priestly ministers was, the priests are frank enough to tell us by a legend: 'There was once a king of the Māgadhas, in the city of Rājagriha, who was wholly dependent on his ministers. A minister of his called Long-ears (*mahākarnin*) became the sole lord of the realm (*ekeçvara*). Inflated by his power, this man tried to usurp the throne, but failed solely because of Fate' (i. 204. 16 ff.). Scarcely an encouraging legend for those that are told to be 'priestly dependents,' as were the kings of this later age.* By an extension of their own importance, the priestly caste gradually represented themselves not only as worthy subjects for moneyed favors, but as the subjects κατ' ἐξοχήν; and when we read 'let the king be content with his name and his umbrella (royal insignia); let him pour out his wealth to his dependents,' we may rest assured that the priest means by dependents none but the priests. Almost ironically is added the proverb: 'a priest knows a priest; a husband knows his wife; a ruler knows his ministers; a king knows a king' (v. 38. 27–28). The teaching of the king's dependence is worked out with utter thoroughness; and lest any deluded king should fancy that priests, from their more theological studies, might be unable to understand special political matters, this broad doctrine is laid down: 'They that have made themselves closely acquainted with general principles, not with special topics, are the truly wise; special knowledge is secondary.'† For these priests have now indeed become 'like unto the gods;' they are the 'gods of the gods,' and can destroy the king that does not believe in them.‡

And yet, side by side with such assumptions, we find, even in late passages, the old military impatience cropping out: 'the

---

are priests, and they precede in processions, etc. (R. ii. 124. 2; 127. 3). In council R. gives as the result of a debate *āikamatya* (unanimous vote), or 'adjusted divergence,' or 'no agreement:' perhaps technical terms, R. v. 77. 7 ff. The expressions used of the king in the Epic quotation above are *durdānto 'rakṣitā durvinītaḥ*. For the moral compare xiii. 32. Compare R. ii. 1. 30, where the same words are applied to those whom the king should hold in control (*niyantā durvinītānāṁ vinītapratipūjakaḥ*).

* *Mantribāndhava* is the expression used of kings in v. 34. 38; they are as dependent upon their councillors as wives are upon husbands, and the priests are the king's 'protectors,' as the god Parjanya is the protector of cattle! This reduces the king to a *puruṣādhama* from a *puruṣa* (cf. v. 163. 3 ff.).

† *prayojaneṣu ye saktā na viçeṣeṣu bhārata, tān aham paṇḍitān manye viçeṣā hi prasaṅginaḥ*; or, reading *çaktā* with C., 'they that are capable in general principles' (ib. 44).

‡ Ib. 41; iii. 200. 89; xiii. 35. 21. More practical destruction than that by means of Vedic rites is often attributed to the priests. The king is now and then warned that they may destroy him by poisoning his food, by curses, etc. (i. 43. 28, 30; 182. 13 ff.).

place for priests is in the hall of debate; good are they as inspectors; they can oversee elephants, horses, and war-cars; they are learned in detecting the faults of food—but let not the (priestly) teachers be asked for advice when emergencies arise' (iv. 47. 28 ff.). And with this is the extraordinary position occupied by the Purohita in the next world, according to Manu—and in this, according to the oath of Viçvāmitra, where it is regarded as a curse to be the family-priest of a king.*

But the general tone of advice, especially in regard to the prince of priests, the king's Purohita, is far different. Whence arose this formidable personage? He is nothing but the last development of that singer of the king's praïses whom, as we shall see, even the early Vedic age possessed. The king, or a priest, or even a man of the people, originally sacrificed, made songs to the gods, and also songs of praise for kings.† But gradually this practice became a right usurped by the priest. The family-priest of the king was now alone entitled to sing a proper hymn to the gods, whereby the king was glorified at a sacrifice. The Guru or teacher remained the tutor. He took care of earthly as well as of heavenly matters. The worldly portion was amalgamated with the spiritual. Both were claimed by the priest. In place of new songs at sacrifices, the old were ritualized, and became stereotyped, sacred. The king who had taken to himself a special man to sing these hymns and perform sacrifice for him found himself indissolubly‡ united to a servant with whose service he at first could not and then afterwards dared not dispense. The servant edged ever nearer to the throne. He laid his hand upon it as if to uphold it; in reality, he made it a step-ladder to his pride. He became more arrogant as he became more secure; and, seating himself above the king to whose height he had mounted, he claimed control of the sceptre. He became a prime-minister; to disobey him was to imperil the soul; to obey was to imperil the throne. The king feared for his soul. He abandoned the throne. The servant ruled his master.§

---

* M. xii. 46; Mbh. xiii. 93. 130. Compare Muir, Sanskrit Texts, i. 128.

† Compare Muir, Sanskrit Texts, i. 280.

‡ Add to this that the office of priest was often hereditary; the prince's adviser is the adviser, perhaps, of his father; that adviser's father the adviser of the prince's grandfather. Thus a deeper veneration.

§ The scene (from the eleventh century) in the third act of the Mudrārākṣasa would lead us to suppose that the king did not dare to make his minister resign, but first waited for him to offer his resignation, daring to provoke him, but allowing him to offer back his badge of office, which is at once accepted (32). We see from the same play (25) that the *açvādhyakṣa* and *yajādhyakṣa*, or officers appointed over the horses and elephants, are maintained in this period on a salary fixed not by the king but by the minister.

We can almost trace this development in the different layers of our poem. Set aside the didactic epigram, and look at the narrative. The priest, powerful even in the Vedic age, reflects that power in the stories of his unbridled insolence—but not at first as an adviser, only as a private, impudent fellow. The Epic Purohitas of the story are servants, not masters, of the king. The assembly is still comparatively free from priestly influence. The family-priest is a private admonisher when his opinion is requested, not a public holder of state polity.

We may, perhaps, sketch his growth somewhat thus. His influence began in the secret council. As his power grew, he ruled the king's thoughts, and persuasively governed the assembly. His next step was to restrain the speech of the assembly, through inspiring fear of contradiction. When the meeting of the people passed into a conference of warriors and priests, and the king sat at the head of the deliberative assembly, he was still a humble auditor. But he was a declaimer, a trained speaker, a skilled logician. He defeated the knights in argument; he overawed the king by his religious lordliness. The people's assembly became a priestly conclave. The secret council became a whisper from priest to king. So the discrepancies between the early story and the late teaching become reconciled. Only thus can we understand the grotesque difference between the different parts of the Epic.*

9. *The Ambassador.*—Beside the Purohita stands in military importance the commander-in-chief of the army. His duties will be explained below. A third high officer on whose position the text spends much care is the ambassador.† He may be either a priest or an officer of military caste. In the former case, the Purohita is chosen. Thus, Drupada sends his Purohita as ambassador to Hastina (v. 6. 1 ff.). But if not priest, any high military hero standing near the throne is sent. Thus Dhritarāshtra sends his charioteer as ambassador (v. 22 ff.), or his younger brother (ii. 58). The allied forces send Krishna as ambassador from Upaplavya. In the Rāmāyaṇa, however, it is assumed that the ambassador will be a wise priest (*paṇḍitaḥ:*

---

* The view here given of what the priest's position really was, in the time when the story of the Epic was the main poem, is based on what the Epic narrative shows us to have been the ruling power in council and debates, and this is not the priestly power; the view of what the compilers and redactors thought it ought to be is based on didactic statements and tales woven into the narrative (earlier) portion, and the claims made by the priests in outside literature. This latter includes, indeed, as acknowledged above, pre-Epic works; but there is no reason to suppose that the kings of the Brahmanic period were so 'under the thumb' of the priests as the latter asserted to be desirable. In this, as in many other points, the Epic narrative is older than its literary form.

† The threefold division of the Nīti, Kām. Nīt. xii. 3, is not yet known.

R. ii. 109. 44). This officer is, of course, a temporary one, whereas the ordinary herald is generally the charioteer, as if this were a fixed duty connected with that profession. To the perfect ambassador eight qualities are assigned as needful. He must be active, manly, speedy, compassionate, clever, faithful, of good family, eloquent.* That is to say, he must be a clever man of the world, with ability to conduct the affairs entrusted to him; and especially a good speaker. Such we find him practically represented. Internationally of interest is the rule that to slay an ambassador is (bad policy and) the height of impiety. 'He that slays an ambassador shall go to destruction; and his ministers also.'† The treatment of the war-ambassador sent by the Pāndus to Hastina shows the state and ceremony accompanying such occasions. The ambassador is received with gracious words at the gate of the city, and escorted to the palace. No word is said of the object of his coming. Greetings and familiar conversation being over, he is assigned an apartment, and goes to rest. Not till the next day does he deliver his message. At sunrise, ushered into the council hall, he reports to the assembled court of prince and nobles the substance of what he had been charged to say. In another case, however, the ambassador gives a verbal report.‡

A verbatim report of the message entrusted to the ambassador is attempted now and then; but when the communication is very long, either the text fails to reproduce the poet's intent, or a certain latitude is permitted to the speaker. We find, for instance, almost an exact reproduction of a lengthy message, but toward the end certain variations occur in our text. The case of Ulūka seems to show that the ambassador was more afraid to return than to go, if the answer he carried back was likely to raise his lord's anger. Those to whom he is sent give him a rough message to take to his king, but personally treat him kindly, and grant him formal permission to stay with them, if he does not wish to return with such a report.[*] As a general thing, the ambassador differs from a mere repeater like the herald in being permitted to exercise judgment and skill in treating with the enemy. As a resident ambassador I find no examples of the use of the *dūta*, who seems intended to go and return at once; but who probably was often retained regularly in the capacity of state-agent, liable at any time to be sent on such errands. From the use in the Epic I should doubt whether this office was not also a later creation, meant to complement other needed offices in a great realm; for the description would apply as well to an occasional messenger as to a stated officer, and the persons employed in the Epic are, as shown above, relatives or the family priest. In the case of Vidura we find an ambassador who, chosen for a message distasteful to him, goes through the form of delivering it as an officer of his king 'appointed against his will' (*balān niyuktaḥ*), and first gives the message 'as told' (although in his own words), but then remains silent until questioned, and thereupon explains that, for his own part, he does not approve of the object for which he was sent.[†]

---

* v. 37. 27: *astabdha* may mean 'modest,' rather than 'active.'

† xii. 85. 26. In this passage seven qualities are given (28)—good morals, aristocratic family, eloquence, adroitness, agreeable speech, 'speaking exactly as was told,' and good memory (cf. vs. 7; further rules in the following verses). Compare M. vii. 63 ff. The official title of the ambassador is *dūta* 'messenger.'

‡ The description is from v. 89. 1 ff. The hospitable reception ought to come first (*kṛtātithyaḥ*, v. 89. 25; compare ib. 91. 18, and the fact that the ambassador had already been the guest of Vidura). But this formality is sometimes passed over. So in the case of Drupada's priestly embassy, and the visit of Sanjaya to the Pāndus. The latter goes rather as a friend, and the etiquette of high life is shown first on his return, when, although anxious to deliver his message at once, he is obliged to send a formal notice of his arrival to the king, and announces himself ready to deliver the answer he has received (v. 32. 1 ff.). Although the ambassador is by his office secured from harm, yet we find evidence that his rights in this regard were not always maintained: for Drupada thinks it necessary to encourage his ambassador by calling his attention to the fact that, 'being an old man and a priest,' as well as a formal legate (*dūtakarmaṇi yuktaḥ*), he will not be injured by those that are to hear his message; the weight lies on 'priest' and 'old man,' rather than on 'legate' (v. 6. 17). The rule of safety is, however, implied in v. 88. 18 (*dūtaḥ . . apāpaḥ katham bandham arhati*), and is often expressed.

10. *Social relations of the King.*—The didactic chapters tell us much on the subject of the 'king's friends,' social as well as political. But not much information can be gleaned respecting the real private social life outside of war. The allies of four sorts (obtained by sharing, by love, by relationship, by artificial means, i. e. bribery; and fifth [!], by virtue, xii. 80. 3, 6) are mirrored in the private circle. Good friends are those gotten by blood-relationship, love, and virtue. Doubtful are those that are friendly as a result of bribes or sharing wealth.

The king may have no private friends, except among the better classes. 'With poor or miserable men high kings can have no friendship. The unlearned loves not the learned; he that drives a chariot is no friend to him that has none; friendship is the fruit of similarity.'[*] So in war kings are not allowed to contend with low persons.[†] So it is urged (xii. 56. 48 ff.) that a king should not joke with his dependents, or be too familiar with them. 'The dependents,' it is said, 'really hate him, being envious of a supporter. They do not like to be dependent; they betray his secrets; they multiply his wishes by bribing and deceiving; and if a king is too gracious, he will find that the subjects divide his realm and corrupt his women; they will even yawn and spit in his presence, and shamelessly make known his private words; and when he has entered the assembly (*pariṣad*), they will mock, saying "thou hast done ill;" and when he is angry, they will laugh; and when he is generous, they will not be thankful; they will mount elephants and horses without regard to his presence; if he is fond of pleasure and adornment, they will blame him; and they will play with him as they would with a bird on a string.'[‡]

---

[*] Compare, for the nearly accurate report alluded to, v. 161. In ib. 163. 5 ff. come the answer and permission to the ambassador to remain.

[†] ii. 58. 1 ff.: we must interpret *yathoktavādī*, 'speaking as was told,' rather freely, to mean sense, not words. So the ambassadors in the Rāmāyaṇa have this epithet without repeating literally what they were told to say. Compare R. ii. 109. 44: *yathoktavādī dūtas te kṛtaḥ paṇḍitaḥ*; ib. vi. 16. 78: *sa tad rāmavacaḥ sarvam anyūnādhikaṁ sāmātyaṁ çrāvayāmāsa*, 'he told him all Rama had said, without addition or deduction.' Family is also demanded by R. (*kule mahati co 'tpannaḥ*, R. v. 81. 47).

Of social rule but little is said. The king, though leader of society and state, may not do just as he pleases; 'he may do as he pleases if he does not offend against public opinion (the world).' Precedent should always be a main factor in his movings. Actively, he should be 'enterprising;' passively, he should 'avoid un-Āryan ways.' Let him not hesitate to sin for the sake of conquest or for the sake of his realm—such in brief should be his private social code as ruler. In the first rule we note the Aryan conservatism; in the last, the influence of the later sophistic priest.[§]

The more common side of the king's life has been discussed above under the head of vices. A word or two more on the subject may here be added. The king may not associate with common people, but in strictness this refers to men; he is surrounded by common women all the time, such as dancers and singers and half-respectable prostitutes, with whom he has what conversation he pleases. We have further evidence that the inner palace was full of such women, and even guards of the king were sometimes constituted of women in later tales.* Although the lower classes (slave-caste, people-caste) naturally do not share in the royal revels when these are of a private nature, they do form a background to the public social displays. At great feasts, coronations, weddings, and the like, and even, as we have seen, at a public religious service, the common people are present, as it were on the outskirts of good society. They flock about and see what is done. They are represented by their singers and musicians, although these are probably the only representatives of the real plebeian classes in actual contact with their superiors. Their like, the artisans and workmen, the small people in general, look on and admire.

---

[*] *sāmyād dhi śakhyaṃ bhavati* (similes similibus), i. 131. 5, 11, 67: cf. ib. 131. 66, 71; 138. 69, *arājā kila na rājñaḥ sakhā bhavitum arhasi*; cf. also ib. 166. 15 and 23, repetition.

[†] *vṛthākulasamācārāir na yudhyante nṛpātmajāḥ*, i. 136. 33; xii. 96. 7.

[‡] So Brihaspati says that a too merciful king would be beaten as an elephant's head is beaten by a trainer, xii. 56. 37–39, B.

[§] xii. 56. 41 (compare M. xii. 105); 58. 1-20. The statement elaborated in this passage, to the effect that a man of enterprise (an active king) is 'better than a voice-hero' (*vāg-vīra*), is ludicrously offensive to the commentator, who rightly supposes a priest to be meant by the latter epithet. He therefore wrongly interprets the 'man of enterprise' as 'one having great priestly wisdom,' and therefore better than a 'voice-hero,' who is an ordinarily wise priest (one is a pandit: the other has *mahāpāṇḍityam*)!

In only one case have we the upper and lower castes on a social plane for a moment, and this incident seems more a reflection of an old custom than one practiced at the time it is described. I refer to the very interesting annual heyday that occurs at the 'branding of the cattle.' What we have in the legend is simply an account of such a picnic (for such it was) as explanation of a king's stratagem. Nevertheless, the description is valuable and unique; and it is to be remarked that, though the crown-prince used the fête as a ruse, it yet appears to have been an actual celebration. The prince wants to get out of town with a large number of people, but without his father's knowing for what he goes. To explain the departure of a force of men from the city, he hits on this plan. Feigning an interest in the proceedings of the ranchmen, he goes to the king, and says that he wishes to attend the 'marking of the cattle,' as it is now the time for this work. The reply of the king shows that this appears a natural request. 'Certainly,' he says, 'one ought to attend to the cattle-marking; go, if you wish.' The prince leaves the town with the large escort he desires to take, and accompanied by the ministers. They go to superintend the counting and branding of the cattle. Each head of cattle was branded at the age of three years. At the ranch there is great gaiety. All the cattle are counted, and the proper head are marked. The cowherds dance and sing at the close of the work. The little court looks on, and patronizes the pleasure of the laborers. I mention the scene because it is a rare idyl in our Epic, and corresponds to court-and-country relations more primitive than the position generally assumed for the king in the Epic would make possible (iii. 240).

---

* In Vikramorvaçī (Act iii.), lamp-women, but respectable, are attendants on the king; in Vāyu P. ii. 26. 178–9 is mentioned a king Çataratha, son of Mūlaka, 'always girt with women through fear of Rāma:' (*nārīkavacaṁ*) *trāṇam icchan* 'women were his breastplate. Çata-, Daça-, and Nava-ratha occur as names of kings. The last is the father of Daçaratha, according to Kūrma P. xxiv. p. 255 (Bib. Ind., çlokas not numbered).

11. *Royal Marriage.*—Having thus examined the recorded ideal life of a Hindu monarch, and tried to discover, as far as legendary history helps us, the real character of the ancient king as contrasted both in moral parts and public functions with that ideal, we have now to note briefly some of the events in the royal life that are of a more personal nature—though in these also we see the king always as an inseparable part of the whole kingdom.

Marriage was permitted to the warrior-caste in general either in accordance with a received ceremonial, or without any rite whatever. The legal rite by which the actual wedding took place differs according to caste. In the case of a warrior, the bride holds in the hand a bunch of arrows, and the two walk around the fire-altar, while a marriage hymn is sung. At the seventh step they become man and wife.* The preceding ceremony consists, in the case of a king, either of a joust where the maiden elects her lord by adjudging her hand to the king who carries himself best in the lists, or who best fulfils some stipulated condition (as when Arjuna, the chief hero of the Epic, performs a difficult feat in shooting, and so wins his wife from many royal competitors); or, as in legendary accounts, there is no joust, but the royal maid to be given in marriage is conducted into a hall where the assembled suitors† are, and, having been led about from one to the other and having had all their names and virtues explained to her, makes on the spot her choice. This latter was the real and only 'self-choosing' (*svayaṁvara*)—a term, however, loosely applied to the decision by tournament as well; though there the maid had, it would appear, only the privilege of excluding from competition such as did not suit her. The Epic mentions casually several cases of *svayaṁvara*, but describes only one of each kind with any fullness.

The much simpler method of marriage, which appears to have obtained largely among knights or kings, was for the knight to find the girl and run away with her. Thus Bhīshma ran away with three girls at once, and challenged any to recover them. So Arjuna, when he found that his brother the king had absorbed his first wife's existence (such is the real interpretation of the Krishṇā relations between Arjuna and Yudhishthira), stole another, in accordance with knightly laws. In fact, this method is especially approved, as an evidence of prowess and survival of the 'good old warrior custom;' though such approval is generally registered as an exculpation and defense of the foregone deed, rather than as an impartial decision between different modes of marriage. In the case of rape of this sort, no religious rite initiatory to connubial connection was regarded as necessary; but if the deed was condoned, the adventurer returned with the girl, and the marriage ceremony was gone through with.[*] In these cases caste weds caste. With the lower classes, the king had what connection he pleased; and though he is advised not to succumb to sensual pleasure, there is no restriction on the extent of his harem.[†] Even with high-caste girls—that is, with girls of the priestly caste—the king is fond of connecting himself without formality. Such are generally represented as the innocent daughters of ascetic priests who live in the woods. The usual thread of the love-story is, that the king hunting sees the hermit's hut, finds the girl, who at once falls in love with him as he with her, and pursuades her easily to a marriage without rite or delay. The old priests, too, were continually doing the same thing; and thus, as legend says, arose most of the best families in Hindu society. Out of the mass of formal law and very informal legend we may gather this. The early king, at a time when his chief occupation was cattle-lifting and pillaging from his neighbors, such as the growth of Indraprastha and the records of cattle-raids preserved in the live Epic show to have been the primitive royal means of life, was accustomed to take his wife or wives as he did his cattle, from whomever he wished and however he wished. As an exhibition of strength, an additional excitement to his own pleasure, and a means of getting what he desired without tedious formality (there is no trace of real exogamy), he ran across the border, ravaged a petty principality, annexed it, drove the cattle home, and took the woman that pleased him for his wife. When political life became complicated, and peace was the present condition of the land, a king with a daughter to wed made a feast, invited the neighboring kings to it, and bade such as chose to contend for the honor to be assembled in his hall. When all were collected, in came the king and his daughter, who had had no formal acquaintance with men, and, scanning the number assembled, she bashfully picked out a husband. She testified her choice by kissing the hem of his garment. Rejoicing, feasting, and the religious rite then followed. Such is the pretty tale in the Nala story.

---

* In the ritual the steps are pro forma; the wedding is performed by rites, verses, symbolic movements, etc.

† The *saciva* attends the wedding also, in R. vi. 40. 18.

---

[*] In the case of Arjuna. Here note that the girl's brother connives at the deed, but the people do not.

[†] But the lowest classes are formally forbidden. Some of the great sages are, however, the sons of slave-women. For some reason or other, the formal law is particularly severe on the Vṛṣalī (a low woman of the mixed castes). Her touch is contamination for the priest, and is forbidden to all the twice-born. The Vṛṣala is so much a synonym for the Çūdra or slave that in enumerating the castes it is sometimes substituted. Compare Vāyu P. ii. 16. 29: *brāhmaṇāḥ, kṣatriyāḥ, vāiçyāḥ, vṛṣalāç cāi 'va* (see just before, *vṛṣa*).

More ceremonious is the pseudo-self-choice, where the maid's 'choice' is conformed to stipulations made by her guardian, or at the most is a choice not of an individual but of the conditions on which she binds herself to accept anyone among several. At a tournament or joust, where the election depended on the strength of the aspirants, there was really no choice left.[*] Besides, at this time the affair was practically settled by arbitration. The marriage of Virāṭa's daughter and Arjuna's son is a pure marriage of convenience. Virāṭa wants to bind the two nations together. He offers his daughter first to Arjuna, who declines. Virāṭa is somewhat disappointed, but says that perhaps Arjuna's son would do just as well, and offers his daughter again to Arjuna for his son. Arjuna consents to this, and the two parents tell the two young people that they are to be married immediately; and they are. It is to this period, I think, that the jousting election (*svayaṁvara*) belongs. There is nothing primitive about it. On the contrary, it is modern throughout. Arjuna's rape of Subhadrā is the only form of 'primitive marriage,' except it be such accidental connubial connections as form the basis of his 'adventures.'[†]

As matter of formal preference, the *svayaṁvara* is declared to be the proper marriage for warriors;[‡] but this is only a general rule, as 'rape is also recommended.'[§] We read of a king reaching the age of thirty-six without marriage.[‖] Usually the age is about half of that, as Abhimanyu marries at the age of sixteen, and the Pāndu brothers could not have been much older when they wedded Krishnā. The wife's 'legal' age was from three to twelve; but this modern view does not correspond with the early accounts of marriages (see below on women).

The sub-wives of the king were not wives but concubines. A later marriage with a woman of higher caste should reduce the former wife of lower caste to the position of a menial. This is probably true only for the period that originates such a formal rule. The law-codes require in all marriages that the husband should marry his highest wife first. Afterwards he may marry 'down.' Thus a warrior should marry a girl of the warrior-caste first. Then he should marry a girl of the people-caste.

---

[*] Compare the self-choice of R. iii. 4. 30: *ya idaṁ dhanur udyamya sajyam ekena pāṇinā, kariṣyati sa sītāyā bhuvi bhartā bhaviṣyati*, 'Sītā's husband shall be the man that can draw this bow with one hand.' In this ceremony a messenger was sent to issue invitations (ib. 31).

[†] These are also late, as adventures. The Citragupta incident is a peculiar application of levirate laws in their final evolution into a substitution of a daughter's son instead of the true son of the levirate.

[‡] *svayaṁvaraḥ kṣatriyāṇāṁ vivāhaḥ*, i. 219. 21.

[§] *prasahya haraṇaṁ cā 'pi kṣatriyāṇām praçasyate*, ib. 22.

[‖] 'Sixteen and eight summers, and four and eight also, he had not enjoyed pleasure of women:' i. 100. 20.

Marriages were celebrated by general public rejoicings, where music is a predominant feature. In regard to these constant descriptions of festival processions, we may say that by reading one we know all. Like exhibition of joy celebrates the return of a conqueror to his native city.*

For further details of marriage, see the general appendix on the status of women. Polygamy with the king and royal family was the rule. Polyandry is unknown except in legends and in the case of the Pāndus themselves, who all married one wife. 'The law of having only one consort'† is in the case of women respected, but it is evident that no man of warrior-caste was thought the better of on account of its observance. As far as sentiment went, a devoted husband is praised for fidelity; but if he grew tired of his wife, he 'over-married' her as a matter of course. The law demands a second wife if the first fails to bear a son.‡

12. *Royal Burial.*§—Of the two old methods of disposing

---

* A charming account of this sort is given in iv. 68. 24 ff. The king hears of his son's victory and immediate return. He bids the courtezans and heads of the army go out and meet the victor. The bell-man mounts an elephant and proclaims the victory at all the cross-roads (*çr̥ṅgāṭakeṣu*). The daughter of the king puts on her holiday clothes (*çr̥ṅgāraveṣā bharaṇā*); and when the city had heard the proclamation, all the people, to greet the prince, go out before the king with their hands crossed for good luck (*sarvam puraṁ svastikapāṇibhūtam*), accompanied by the sound of drum and flute and shell (*vārija*), and they are all dressed in their best clothes (*veṣāiḥ parārdhāiḥ*). And with them go the praisers and the singers and the encomiasts, who also play on the drum and the flute (*sūta, māgadha, nāndīvādya*); and they rejoicing welcome him home. Compare further the account (in xii. 37. 41 ff.) of a procession advancing to Hāstinapur. The women drove in front on lofty cars; the king was praised by clapping of hands as well as music. The city was adorned with white wreaths, flowers, and flags. The main street was ornamented, and incense was burned in it. Flowers, incense, and waterpots also adorned the palace. In iv. 71. 33 the king offers his whole kingdom to the Pāndus just before the marriage ceremony (cf. ff.). The *sūta, māgadha,* etc., are professional players. Compare the section on music, below, and xiv. 64. 2, 'praised by *sūta, māgadha,* and *bandin.*' They are generally accompanied by wrestlers, boxers, mimes, *granthikas,* and those that ask how one has slept (*sāukhyaçāyikāḥ*). Compare, too, v. 36. 55 ff.

† iii. 205. 5, *ekapatnyaḥ . . . striyaḥ*; R. v. 2. 21, *ekapatnīvrata.*

‡ Āp. ii. 5. 11. 12; M. ix. 81.

§ Compare Roth, *Todtenbestattung,* Z. D. M. G., viii.; Müller, *Ueber Todtenbestattung,* etc., ib. ix. 1 ff., and India, p. 233 ff., on the ceremony for the dead; Zimmer, *Altind. Leben,* p. 400 ff.; Rājendralālamitra, Indo-Aryans, ii. 114 ff.; Caland, *Über Totenverehrung bei einigen der indo-germanischen Völker* (1888).

of the dead, the perhaps later form, cremation, had in the Epic age superseded earth-burial. The king was burned in the midst of his sorrowing subjects, who came together to witness the pageant. Only children of not more than two years of age were buried in earth. These two forms, earth and fire, are the only ones recognized. Embalming is not described. The remarkable trick of the Pandus on entering Upaplavya in disguise would imply a monstrous imitation of Persian exposure to birds, were we able to imagine that the pretext suggested could really have been preferred. It occurs in a late book that the Pāndus hide their arms in a tree, and agree to say, if any one should try to investigate the spot, that it is holy and must not be touched, because 'according to the family custom, practiced by our ancestors, we have hung up in yonder tree the body of our old mother, recently deceased at the age of one hundred and eighty.'* The formal death-procession is for the king alone, or, if slain in battle, for the king and his dead comrades. When the royal household goes forth to mourn for the king, we find that his old father and the women of the city proceed to the battlefield, followed by all the artizans, the merchants, the people (agriculturists and cattle dealers), and, in short, all the laborers. Then arises the sound of lament, each wailing his lost. And they sing the songs of praise above their slaughtered heroes.† Or, again, in another scene, the king dies, and the four castes go out in procession and watch the burning of the king's body. After the royal funeral, the people mourn twelve days, priests and all lamenting the dead king and sitting upon the ground.‡ Then follows the ceremony for the dead (*çrāddha*). A short abstract will describe the funeral. The body of the king is covered with flowers by relatives and friends. The bodies of the king and his wife are carried on the shoulders of friends.§ All the royal insignia (*cāmara*, *vyajana*, and the umbrella) are borne along.* Music accompanies the procession. The members of the court and the royal officers with the sacrificial priests lead, dressed in white; and honey and butter are carried in a sacred fire-vessel. All the castes follow, grieving. Gifts are strewn among the people by the courtiers and members of the royal house; they repeat always the mourning refrain 'alas! whither goeth our king!'† Men of the people and slave-castes take part in the procession. Also the wives of the warriors join the crowd. They come at last to the Ganges, and the body of the king is bathed in the holy river. It is then clothed anew, and adorned with sandal-paste and white robes 'made in that land.' The bodies are then burned with sandal-paste, and the people show their grief by sleeping upon the ground.‡ The religious ceremony in memory of the dead is called the *āurdhvadehika*, and must always be accompanied by gifts to the people and to the priests.§

---

* iv. 5. 32–33. I find not the slightest trace of such a mode of burial elsewhere, though it was an extraordinary statement to invent, if the custom appeared as peculiar to the writers as to the historian. This book is late—but so late as to be infected by Persian custom? Yet 'family custom' could cover any oddity in India.

† xi. 10. 16. The dead are heaped by rank on piles (pyres) and burned. Compare ib. 26. 30: *citāḥ kṛtvā prayatnena yathāmukhyān narādhipān, dāhayāmāsur avyagrāḥ çāstradṛṣṭena karmaṇā*. Compare R. ii. 83. 30. Arrian recounts that the Hindus have no tombs, but 'sing songs' over the dead (τίθενται τοῖσιν ἀποθανοῦσι . . καὶ τὰς ᾠδὰς αἳ αὐτοῖσιν ἐπᾴδονται, c. 10).

‡ i. 127. 20, 32: compare xv. 39. 16.

§ i. 127. 9: that is, in a litter, as I suppose in a similar case to be the meaning of *yānena nṛyuktena bahumūlyena mahatā* (a large litter, costly, drawn by men); as elsewhere, *yāna* may refer to anything that carries, but is different from the common palanquin (xv. 22. 19 ff.). unless here we have really a wagon drawn by men (xvi. 7. 19).

The question of widow-burning implied above resolves itself for Epic usage thus. Mādrī burns herself with her royal husband. Four wives are burned with Krishna. Çantanu's funeral shows no such custom. Elsewhere in the didactic portions the custom is enjoined (see appendix on women). Lassen says (*Ind. Alt.* i. 592) that absence of widow-burning is found in the Rāmāyaṇa alone. This is, therefore, not quite correct. Moreover, the mention in the Rāmāyaṇa of a woman 'adorned and wanting to die and obtain final happiness,' and the heroine's own remark that she is not *satī* (the technical word denoting a woman willing to undergo *suttee*) shows the custom known here, although not taking place in the case of the chief characters.*

---

* The burial-hymn of the Rig-Veda (x. 18) assumes a time when each man bore the bow, and had it broken on his funeral pyre. The Brahmanic rules make a distinction of caste, and keep the bow for the warrior, while a goad (*aṣṭrā*) is laid in the hand of a man of the people. Compare Weber, *Ind. Stud.* x. 25.

† To answer this question very literally, we may refer first to xvi. 7. 23, where in burying a king we find the place chosen for his body was 'the place that was dear to him when he lived;' and as to the destination of his soul, compare the list of places where dead heroes go in xv. 33. 13 ff.

‡ The burning of the bodies is here represented as having already taken place! The king died in the forest, and the wife mounted the funeral pyre and was burned with him (i. 125. 31). After this the bodies are brought to Hāstina, and the ceremony takes place as described above—where, from the description of the anointing and dressing of the 'king's body,' it is clear that no former burning is imagined, and that the queen is only brought in as an appendix: once when they bear the king 'with the queen,' and again at the end, where they place the 'bodies' on the fire. Evidently two accounts are here confounded. After the king had been burned with Mādrī on the pyre, there could not have been much corpse left, or not enough to dress and smear with sandal-paste.

§ xii. 42. 7. Such gifts free the soul from sin. A list of them is given in the late books. The recipients in these descriptions are the priests. Compare xiii. 136. 10, etc. Here 'shoes and umbrellas' are added after other gifts, though generally they are to be of great value, cattle, gold, gems, land, tanks, etc. Compare also xiv. 14. 15, where 'great gifts' are bestowed. In xiv. 14. 4 ff. the religious ceremony lasts ten days, during which time the king makes presents to the priests: the ceremony being a general warrior-funeral for kings and knights fallen in the war. The surviving king, for whose sake the war was fought, becomes by this means 'free of debt.' Even villages are given away by him (compare also xv. 11. 10; 13. 11; xiv. 62. 2 ff., where 'thousands of priests' are feasted, and garments, gold, and cows are given away).

The royal burial in the Rāmāyaṇa is, except in unessentials, the same as in the Mahābhārata. At sunrise all the people assemble; the perfumes, oils, etc., are used as described above. The king's body is borne on a palanquin (*çibikā*), and is carried, adorned and clothed, in procession, while in front the praisers go, chanting the usual eulogy. After ten days' mourning, on the twelfth and thirteenth days, the *çrāddha* or funeral feast is given.† The non-Epic but legal code gives us the statement that at the king's death all interest on borrowed money stops, and Vedic study is suspended. Both are resumed on the consecration of the new king.*

---

* Both the warriors' widows being provided for by the king (see above), and the Rāmāyaṇa's word a 'woman is called (scornfully) "a widow" just the same, though she be rich' (R. iv. 22. 17), show that in general the widows of warriors, both in the Mahābhārata and in the Rāmāyaṇa, are not thought of as dying with their husbands. On the other hand, acquaintance with the practice of not allowing women to live when deprived of their husbands seems to me to be implied in the above-mentioned quotations. In the first case, a woman parted from her husband exclaims: 'fie upon me, un-Aryan and bad wife that I am; since I live even for a moment when separated from him, and (in so doing) live an evil life' (R. v. 26. 24–25). Compare the like words in the following quotation from our Epic, where the reference is (without any doubt) to widow-burning: *patihīnā tu kā nārī satī jīvitum utsahet, evaṁ vilapya . . . pativratā sampradīptam praviveça hutāçanam* (xii. 148. 9). In both we have, it will be noticed, the same exposition of the *satī* (Anglo-English *suttee*) or 'good wife.' The practice touched probably only the chief wife of a king at first, and was afterwards extended to the wives of warriors not royal. It appears to be a southern custom. In Bali, according to Friederich, widow-burning is confined almost entirely to princely families, and here *satī* is distinguished from *bela*, the latter being a separate fire for the wife without the crease (which was used in *satī*), J. R. A. S., N. S., ix. The second quotation given above contains a reference to the same subject, and reads: 'then they saw in astonishment the (doomed) city of Laṅkā, adorned like a woman that wishes to die and obtain final happiness' (*dadṛçus te tadā laṅkāṁ vihasanto hy alaṁkrtām, paçcimāṁ çriyam āpannāṁ narīm iva mumūrṣatīm*) R. vi. 15. 27. (Perhaps *paçcimāṁ kriyām* is intended as in R. vi. 96. 10, meaning 'the death-ceremony.') Compare Mbh. xvi. 5. 4: *dadarça dvārakāṁ vīro mṛtanāthām iva striyam.* Final happiness is a wife's portion when she dies with her husband. A late work like the Pār. G. S. both allows re-marriage and praises the *satī*, since she saves her husband from hell, and dwells in heaven as many years as she has hairs on her body (three and a half *crores*): iv. 28, 30–31. Compare also R. vi. 68. 33 ff.

† R. ii. 83. 1 ff., 26: 86. 1 ff. Compare ib. ii. 68. 47–56 (three days of mourning).

13. *The Imperial City.*—There is no part of Hindu literature so old that walled cities are not mentioned in it.† There are, on the other hand, no purely Hindu ruins antique enough to prove that stone-walled cities were known before Alexander. From each fact arises a contradictory theory. Investigators have been prone to lay weight on one or the other of these proofs, and discredit the force of the other. The archæologist stands opposed to the literary student. Native scholars have naturally preferred to make the Vedic allusions to walled towns over-reach the negative evidence of lack of remains. They also lay stress on the frequent mention of walls, ramparts, gates, etc., in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa.‡ Giving due regard to both claims,§ it seems to me that a fair and middle possibility presents itself. Since the Vedic literature names, we may assume that the period represented knew,

---

* Vās. ii. 49; G. xvi. 32. But see Bühler's note to Vasishtha.

† Compare the castles of the Dasyus, etc., made of iron and very numerous, a list of which is given from the Rig-Veda in Muir, Sanskrit Texts, ii. 378 ff.

‡ One point in the latter quotations has, I think, not been brought out: it is the standing epithets applied to the towns in the Rāmāyaṇa. Strictly speaking, we have no descriptions here; we have one set of phrases constantly repeated with slight variations. Compare *saprākārā satoraṇā* in R. vi. i. 34, 40; 2. 14; 16. 57; 25. 33; *sāṭṭaprākāratoraṇā*, ib. v. 35. 35; 51. 24; 56. 142 (*sāṭṭatoraṇā*). A slight variation occurs in ib. vi. 14. 19 ff. (the *prākāra* is of iron, ib. v. 72. 11). These walls shake with a noise (*saprākārāṭṭālakā, satoraṇā*, vi. 16. 53–54; so *prākārās toraṇāni ca*, vi. 46. 136; notice *saprākārā satoraṇā* in 16. 58, in 57, and compare 22, all in one section), and shake with the pounding of fists (*prākāra* and *toraṇa*, ib. 17. 8). Now this phrase occurs in various ways in the Mahābhārata, as in iii. 284. 2 (describing Lankā), *dṛḍhaprākāratoraṇā*; viii. 33. 19, *gṛhāṭṭālakasaṁyuktam bahuprākāratoraṇam* (describing the city in the sky); xv. 5. 16, *puraṁ ca te suguptaṁ syād dṛḍhaprākāratoraṇam, aṭṭāṭṭālakasambādhaṁ ṣaṭpadaṁ sarvatodiçam*; xvi. 6. 23–24, *imāṁ nagarīm . . . prākārāṭṭālakopetāṁ samudraḥ plāvayiṣyati*, etc. But it occurs in all cases in places which would otherwise be thought late—as here, in the Rāma legend; in a fanciful tale woven into the battles; in the didactic recommendations of one of the latest books; in the prophecy of the flooding of Dvārakā, a still later addition; even the commentator takes the inner defense to be of barbed wood (*upaçalya*, iii. 15. 6). It seems, therefore, as if without prejudice we might affirm that walled cities are known in early times; strong stone walls and battlemented towers belong, however, to thelate-Mahābhārata-Rāmāyaṇa period, and are there predicated of cities in such a way as to lead us to suppose that the poet even then did not describe what often existed, but what had been set as a poetically correct method of description, and preserved as a model. Thus also Ag. P. 238. 28 describes a town as *uccaprākāratoraṇam*. Compare also Vāyu P. i. 38. 13; 39. 36, 51; 40. 6, 10, 14, 16. In all these cases we find the same standing epithet.

§ And to the Greek account, Arrian (c. 10) saying that coast cities are of wood, inland of brick. He describes also the size of the moats, etc.

walled towns. But it is not at all necessary to assume that these walls were of more permanent material than hardened earth, protected perhaps by ditches and palisades. Such is the *vapra*, a wall of earth flung up for fortifications, and often spoken of, even in the Epic, and amid the pompous descriptions of 'iron walls' and other highly improbable latenesses. Such too is the *caya*, which is found in the Mahābhārata as a city defense, a mere bank of earth. These two are sometimes joined in one description.[*]

But if the accounts of full fortifications must be regarded as foreign to the first form of the poem, this is exactly what, in accordance with a reasonable theory of the origin of the poem, we should expect to find. Descriptions of cities belong to the latest amplification of the original.

With full consciousness, then, that the city described belongs to the imperial, not to the regal, period of the poem[†]—that is, to that period when the acts of the heroes were finally exalted as much as possible by the last revisers—we may examine the general plan of a Hindu city, as it is represented perhaps not earlier than the fifth century after the Christian era. It had high, perhaps concentric walls about it, on which were watch-towers. Massive gates with strong doors,[‡] protected chiefly by a wide bridged moat, the latter filled with crocodiles and armed with palings, guarded the walls. The store-house was built near the rampart. The city was laid out in several squares.[§] The streets were lighted with torches and watered.* The traders and the king's court made this town their residence. The farmers lived in the country, each district guarded, if not by a town modelled on the great city, at least by a fort of some kind. Out of such forts grew the towns. Round the town, as round the village, was the 'common land' to some distance (later converted into public gardens, as we see in the Mudrārākṣasa). In the city special palaces existed, for the king, the princes, the chief priests, ministers, and military officers. Besides these and humble dwellings (the larger houses being divided into various courts), there were various assembly-halls, dancing-halls, liquor-saloons, gambling-halls, courts of justice, and the booths of small traders, with goldsmiths' shops, and the work-places of other artisans. The arsenal appears to have been not far from the king's apartments. Pleasure parks abounded. The royal palace (see above, p. 118) appears always to have had its dance-hall attached.† The city gates ranged in number from four to eleven, and were guarded by squads of men and single wardens.‡ Doorkeepers guarded the courts of the palace, as well as the city gates.§

---

[*] Compare R. v. 9. 15: *vaprāiḥ çvetacayākārāiḥ*, 'by walls of earth and heaps of white earth;' and Mbh. iii. 160. 39: *prākāreṇa . . . çāilād abhyucchrayavatā cayāṭṭālakaçobhinā*. The commentator on the last explains *caya* as the foundation-bank of the real wall; *aṭṭālaka* is the house on top of the wall (cf. *nirvyūha*): a necessary explanation, as the wall is here mountain-high and golden. I imagine such heaps (*caya*) and banks of loose earth (*vapra*) were first used. Then came the defense of palisade and watch-tower. Long after came solid masonry. In fact, all the Epic descriptions of solid walls are late. Neither Indraprastha nor Hāstina could have had stone walls in the earliest account. It is evident, too, that in Mbh. i. 185. 6, where the Pāndus come to Pañcāla and 'see the town and headquarters (*skandhāvāra*), and live in a potter's house,' outside the town, only an open unwalled town is thought of, lying like a camp, round a fort (*pura*), and with headquarters: though at once the place of tournament is elaborately described as built with walls.

[†] We find later rules for building *prāsāda*, *nagaravāstu*, etc., in Ag. P. 104, 105; and careful estimates and rules for houses in Bṛ. Saṁhitā, 53, not comparable with the Epic. See further reference below.

[‡] In xv. 16. 3: 'the king left Hāstinapur by a high gate' (*sa vardhamānadvāreṇa niryayāu gajasāhvayāt*); and, as usual, the people ascend the roofs to look at the procession.

[§] The Mbh. recommends six, but I find only four mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 48. 19. Compare *puraṁ ṣaṭpadaṁ sarvatodiçam*, Mbh. xv. 5. 16. N. thinks that this implies seven walls: not necessarily.

In the well-hid inner court the king's secluded life, as represented in the later luxury, enabled him to pass the time 'on soft couches and lulled by music' (v. 36. 55). Interesting is the fact that, with all its extravagance, the city does not seem to be that of the time of Varāhamihira. Where all, as in these descriptions, is explained minutely down to small detail, we miss the *vīthikā* and *alinda* terraces, so carefully described by the Bṛhat Saṁhitā, and find for the exact statement of many-storied houses in the latter only a vague allusion to stairs or ladders in the Epic (*sopāna* : i. 185. 20); just as we miss the *nīrājanā* ceremony, and any allusion in the life of the characters to dramatic entertainment other than dance and mime-shows (as in ii. 33. 49, *paçyanto naṭanartakān*).*

---

* R. vi. 112. 42 : *siktarathyāntarāpaṇā*. As the watering of the streets is rather unique, it may be well to give a special reference for this point : Indraprastha is described as *sammṛṣṭasiktapanthā*, Mbh. i. 221. 36.

† *nartanāgāra*, iv. 22. 25 ff.

‡ Kaṭha Up., v. 1, speaks of a town with eleven gates as a possibility ('the body is like a town with eleven gates'). Nine gates are given to a town in Varāha P. 52. 5 : *navadvāram* . . *ekastambhaṁ catuṣpatham*. Lankā has four bridged gates (eight in all, and eight walls : see R. vi. 93. 7, and note below). Four gates are implied in the sixth act of Mṛcchakaṭika, where the men are told to go to the four quarters to the gates. The joke in Mṛcch. (Act v.) on the guard of the town being *senā* implies a large military force resident in the town, this being the real guard instead of the nominal protectors, the squads of military police.

§ These courts have mosaic pavements of gold in R. vi. 37. 27, 58 ; see Mbh. i. 185. 20 ; ii. 33 and 34 (*kuṭṭima* of gems).

The imperial city is represented as supplied with everything necessary to withstand a siege, from elephants and horses, in case of arming at the last, to doctors for the wounded; as well as with all kinds of food, grain, etc.; and combustible material, such as resin, pitch, etc., which is to be furnished to the soldiers for army uses. The gates have two doors, and cross-bars, while loopholes are mentioned in the walls. They are defended by heavy machines placed over the gates, probably for projecting large shafts at the foe, or dumping rocks upon them, as they cross the moat. It is recommended that kings should suppress drinking-shops, bawds, peddlers, sodomites, and gamblers: which seldom appears to have been done. On the contrary, he is also told to have stores of liquor, and dancers and actors to amuse himself with.†

---

* Although a kind of drama is known to the latest lists of literature (see above, p. 56, and below on music). This would fix the *terminus ad quem*, including as a whole the pseudo-Epic, but not necessarily the following books or even earlier sporadic religious outcries, the insertion of which latter might be put at any date without much affecting the poem. The Harivaṅça shows its posteriority to the Epic in many ways (as e. g. *nīrājanā*), and this was known in the seventh century.

† Besides xii. 86. 4 ff., and 69. 14 ff., compare for descriptions of cities (although they all agree closely, and differ mainly in extent of description) the short but comprehensive account in iii. 15 (Dvārakā); i. 207. 30 ff. (Indraprastha); iii. 173. 3 (floating city); 207. 7 (Mithilā); 283. 3 and 284. 4–30 Rāvaṇa's Lankā); viii. 33. 19 (skytown); xv. 5. 16 (ideal town). In the Rāmāyaṇa we find nearly the same descriptions as those in this later part of the Epic. The strong gates, machines, etc., with lighted lamps and other modern features, in R. i. 5. 8; ii. 5. 11 ff. Lankā has four gates, with four iron bridges crossing the moat, each gate consisting of two doors. Drinking halls (*āpānaçāla*), flower-stores (*puṣpagṛhāṇi*), etc., abound (R. v. 72. 8, 13; 15. 8; ii. 103. 12 ff.). The broad streets (*pratolī*), mansions, and palaces (*harmyaprāsāda*) are generally described as profusely decorated with flags and protected by machines (ii. 87. 22; 94. 19). The walls here are furnished with battlements (*prākāravaḍabhī*, vi. 14. 22) on which the defenders stand. Squads (*gulmāḥ*) are placed above the city, vi. 31. 3 (all R.). The countersign (literally 'seal') given at the city gate is alluded to in Mbh. iii. 15. 19 ('no inhabitant goes in or out without the seal,' *amudraḥ*); and in i. 42. 15 we have the *dvāḥstha* or palace door-keeper (*dāuvārika* in the drama) at each *kakṣyā*, court. Several of these courts in one palace are mentioned, even as many as seven in the Rāmāyaṇa, where they are guarded by young men armed with knives and bows (R. ii. 13. 1). The *antaḥpuram* is behind the third *kakṣyā*, and contains a play-ground (*ākrīḍam*) with flowers and fountains, where the women amuse themselves (*pramadāvanam*), xii. 325. 29 ff. The enterer must be announced (*niveditaḥ*). Compare with this iii. 133. 13, where a new-comer says to the porter: 'I want to see Bandin in the assembly room (*rājasaṁsadi*); take my name to the king at once, door-keeper' (*nivedayasva māṁ dvāḥstha rājñe*). Compare R. ii. 3. 5, *dvāsthenā 'vedita*, and R. vi. 8. 37, etc. The keeper of the gate, R. ii. 73. 26. The land around the town is full of farmers and artisans: that is, in peace, they live outside as well as within the great cities (i. 109. 4). In

I believe the relative size of buildings and width of roads is not, as in Puranic literature and the Bṛhat Saṁhitā, established by any rule. Absence of such rule, where all is so carefully defined as in the Çānti, should have weight in discussing the age of the latter.* Not unworthy of notice in connection with these almost modern towns is the older statement concerning a king's proper 'forts' or defenses, incongruously welded into the late portion of the Epic.. They are six-fold: viz., a defense consisting of a desert, of water, of earth, of wood, of a hill, or of

---

attacking the walls, elephants were employed, hence *purabhettāraḥ* or 'town-breakers,' ii. 61. 17. So the Greeks say. Compare Aelian, xvii. 29 (strong walls! perhaps evidence of lack of stone). The 'four kinds of physicians' employed are for cases of poisoning, arrow-wounds, sorcery, and general practice (xii. 69. 50–60). Wealth of a palace is described ii. 34, and 51. 3 ff.: blankets, skins, cloth of wool, catskin, ratskin, gold-thread, mantles, as well as gems and jewelry of every kind. Trees of all sorts are kept in town, especially the edible milktree (xii. 89. 1). It is interesting to note that besides regular spies the king has unmilitary, in fact priestly squads stationed in outlying towns, as a refuge in case he has to flee his capital (xii. 86. 29; 140. 40). For vices to be cast out, compare xii. 88. 14–16. In case of siege (for fear of fire), the thatch-covered houses are to be mud-plastered. The list of weapons in xii. 69 is unexpectedly simple; but we note, what has often been denied (M. vii. 90: see below), that poisoned (*digdha*) arrows are recommended; just as we saw above, p. 111, that the king is told to be acquainted with 'use of poison.' In regard to the 'battering rams' and 'catapults' generally understood by the machines (*yantra*) spoken of in the text, compare more particularly below; note here, however, from the Rāmāyaṇa, that these machines are not battering rams and probably not catapults, but are primitive and awkward contrivances placed over the city gates and in other parts of the town (which should be full of them) for the purpose of casting arrows of great size and stones. They are 'strong and firm,' but appear to be of little use; for, though carefully adjusted at the beginning of the conflict, they do not do harm enough to be mentioned in connection with actual damage inflicted: over the gates, R. v. 72. 8; town full of them (*yantrāḍhyām ūrdhvaprākāratoraṇām*), R. vi. 16. 22; to cast rocks (*yantrotkṣiptopalā iva*), R. v. 64. 24; strong and firm, R. v. 73. 1–12; carefully adjusted, R. ii. 109. 52. That they cast arrows or heavy shafts is plain from the fact that, like bows, they are furnished with (bow) strings, *sajjayantra*, R. vi. 14. 20, to be literally translated: compare the 'strong bows' (*yantrāiḥ . . . dṛḍhadhanvibhiḥ*), R. v. 72. 13. (Compare R. v. 9. 19, *sāyudha*.) There is not a single indication that they could have been worked by explosive powder. I have purposely taken all these citations from R. alone, as the later work. Even the Purāṇa era knows *yantras* as general projectile weapons, the best being the bow. Compare the laud: *yantrāṇāṁ dhanur eva ca* in Vāyu P. i. 30. 234.

* The Puranic rule is found further in V. P. i. 6; Vāyu P. i. 8. 96 ff. (distance of *kheṭa*, etc.). The Puranic city may be illustrated by Varāha P. xi. 32 ff., a city built by a priest much like these of the later Epic. Of great historical interest are the 'stories' in the house described in the Pañcadaṇḍachatraprabandha (*ekadvibhūmī atikramya*, etc., ch. 3, as compared with the eight level courts described in a courtesan's house in the Mṛcchakaṭika (Weber's note, 153 a): though I doubt if this description (*dvitīyabhūmyāṁ jagāma*, etc.) warrants our assuming a seven-story house, with the bath-room on the sixth floor. Perhaps the *bhūmis* sloped up-hill.

men.* A reference to the Manu-statute shows that the six are understood of the best places where a capital city might be. 'He should live in a city fortified by a desert, by an earth (wall), by water, by trees, by men, or by a hill; but best of all, let him occupy a hill-fort (town set on a hill).' This would imply that stone walls were not known. It is the commentator who adds to the wall 'of earth' the words 'or of stone or brick.'

14. *Note on caste-exchange.*—In the last act of the Vikramorvaçī and first of the Uttara Rāmacarita, we find the king preparing to desert his throne and become a hermit, leaving the crown-prince to rule. This is a legitimate imitation of the old stories. But in the Epic the right to do this is not conceded without a strife. The desire of King Yudhishthira, mentioned twice in our Epic, to give up his royal life and become a hermit like the old sages, leads to an interesting discussion, the more so as his own father did the like. Here the propriety of the act is called in question, and the arguments advanced on each side are worth quoting. They show that Pāndu either did not give up his throne, as generally assumed, or did so for other than simply religious reasons: perhaps because he was fond of hunting, or perhaps because he was a leper, though the latter supposition is from many points of view improbable. The proposal to leave the throne is especially disagreeable to the priests, as a king pious enough to renounce his kingdom would be just the one they would prefer to have on (their) throne. They admit that in ancient times a few cases of kings' doing this are recorded: such, for instance, as that of Viçvāmitra and others, who being kings became priests;† but to resort to a hermitage is the duty of a priest, and not of a king; for protection is the duty of a king, and is so recorded by the ancients; but by doing penance in a wood he wins no worlds (hereafter); for he whose soul is given up to nothing but (religious) duty does not conquer the earth. Begging (another mark of the priest's vocation) is no more his business than living like a farmer or a slave; his duty is to be strong.'‡ Again:§ 'all the orders say that a warrior should not practice (priestly) begging.' Although the king of the Pāndus is aware of this rule, he is equally familiar with the tales, alluded to above, of kings who have provided a precedent for him by becoming hermits: that is to say, practically Brahmans (one of these even gaining priest-

---

* xii. 56. 35; from the legal literature, M. vii. 70-71: Āp. ii. 10. 25. 2-3.

† *ye jātā kṣatriyebhyaç ca brāhmaṇās te ca te çrutāḥ*, i. 137. 44: cf. ix. 39. 36 ff. Sindhudvīpa, Devāpi are among the few. Another account of Viçvāmitra is in xii. 4 (see above, pp. 73. 159).

‡ iii. 52. 14 and ib. 33. 72 ff., with ib. 51.

§ v. 73. 3: compare xv. 4. 5.

hood 'by force').* That the act was really common is shown by the fact that it is the first thing of which a king weary of reigning thinks, as in the case of the reigning king in the ninth book. In this passage, the kingdom Yudhishthira desires is freely offered him, the reigning king proposing to 'enter the wood, clothed in deer-skin,' i. e. as a hermit; but Yudhishthira replies: 'To receive presents is not permitted to a knight; I will fight for your throne, not take it as a gift.'† Having fought and conquered, he too grows weary of the kingdom and desires to become a hermit. The following summarizes the argument, conducted on the one hand by the pious king and on the other by (the priest speaking through) Arjuna, his warrior brother, and Drāupadī, the queen. The king: 'So far as I can see, there is no such good for a man as renouncing the world; for revelation says that such a man can not sin again.' Arjuna: 'What a weak and unmanly idea! what is a king if he renounces the world? He is a worthless man. He has no property; and what is life without wealth? Love, happiness, heavenly joy depend on wealth. Wealth is necessary for the glory of the family; yes, even for the increase of religious and other duties; in fact, it is the chief duty of a king to have wealth; a man without wealth possesses neither this world nor the next; he that takes a man's wealth takes away his religion (means of right acting). Do not the gods themselves seek to slay their own relatives to get their wealth? Why, even robbery is approved of in the Veda. What do the priests teach and make sacrifices for? To get wealth. Kings must have wealth in order to provide sacrifices. Do not therefore give up your throne and wealth.' The king: 'Is wealth needful? All wealth is not good: for instance, a man would not be happy if he were to steal the property of the gods.' Arjuna: 'Not every one that goes into the wood is a true renouncer of the world; but he that lives a holy life is the true hermit; moreover, it is a priest's business to be a hermit; the sages say so. The priests ought to have gifts from the king; but if the king becomes a priest, there will be no one to enrich the priests. Besides, a king that has conquered the earth and then gets no enjoyment as fruit of his trouble lives a fruitless life.' The queen: 'a warrior that cannot inflict a blow is not splendid (*na bhāti*, non fulget); he does not get land; to be mild to all creatures, to take gifts, to study, and to do penance, ought to be a priest's duty, not a king's; for a king ought to protect people, and punish people. Punishment wakes when men sleep, and raises his staff; he (Punishment) guards three things: gain, piety, and desire.

---

* i. 71. 29.

† ix. 31. 52. 57. His victory was, however, already assured.

Therefore a king that cannot punish is guilty of sin in regard to gain, piety, and desire. You call it doing penance to renounce the world, but a brave king's renunciation of the world is dying on the field of battle.' The king: 'I know the ordinances; I know the double opinion of those that say on the one hand "act," on the other "forsake the world." I know all the (radical) arguments thought out by the roots, and I know the divine rule; thou, my brother, hast no need to quote the sages' law to me. Thou knowest only weapons. The delicate meaning of the law thou canst not see; thou hast learned to fight, but not to think; some saints go into the wood; some go north, and some go south; but no one yet can show the one road that goes to deliverance, though the priests point out many ways of salvation. Some revere and some scorn; some inflict corporal pain upon themselves; some rely on ceremonies; others deny the efficacy of such things, and they are logical and hard to convince. Moreover, there are scorners that speak much in assemblies and are fond of talking; they run over the earth to persuade men. But at the end the wise, the learned, the great, the best knowers of the law are in doubt.'*

The final view as adopted by the king (xii. 21. 11 ff.) is that 'some men slay, and some philosophize; but Manu says that one should be mild and do no harm; consequently even a warrior may pursue such a life and yet gain heaven with its fruits; although *nirvāṇa* is very hard to win.'†

## IV. THE MILITARY POSITION OF THE RULING CASTE.

1. *Philosophy of War.*—It has long been popular to dwell upon the religious and meditative nature of the Hindus. We think of them as priests, not as soldiers. In general, this is not wrong; but in so doing we ignore an important element in the constituents of the Hindu character. This theosophic vein

---

* xii: 7. 37 ff.; refutation, ib. 26. 25 ff.; also ib. 12. 14 ff.; 14. 14 ff.; 19. 1 ff. Much of this section belongs with Manu. Except for 'punishment.' birds and beasts would devour men; the pupil would not study nor milk the beautiful cow (for his teacher): the girl would not marry,' etc. (15. 45 = M. vii. 21); *daṇḍa* from *damanāt* and *daṇḍanāt* (*adāntān damayaty açiṣṭān daṇḍayaty api*); the rest compare with M. vii. 25 ff. Concise end of caste-argument is given in 15. 23: *yathā sṛṣṭo 'si tathā bhavitum arhasi*, 'be what thou art created.' The 'double opinion,' *ubhayaṁ vacanam*, of 19. 1 ff., is expressed thus: *kuru karma tyaja (iti) ca*, 'do acts, forsake acts.'

† The last shows the Buddhistic influence not more than the *ahiṅsā* doctrine preceding. The Manu quotation (M. iv. 2) is perverted: see my paper on Manu in the Mahābhārata. The whole passage is of course late; but the later it is, the more interesting from the point of view of the modern castes.

was neither original nor universal. Our earliest literature is indeed religious, though with but little mysticism. But the religious element did not penetrate deeply into unpriestly classes One is too apt to dispose of the general Hindu as Max Müller does with the words: 'To the Greek, existence is full of life and reality; to the Hindu, it is a dream and a delusion.' (Ancient Sanskrit Lit., p. 18.) If we mean by the Hindu the Hindu philosopher and priest, this is true; but if we apply it to the Hindu at large, it is as misleading as to interpret the spirit of our earlier Europe by the writings of a Thomas à Kempis or a Molinos. The priest certainly came to believe in life as an illusion, and his doctrine has had its great and bad effect upon the Epic poetry; but if we study the coarse, sensual, brutal, strife-loving, blood-hungry Hindu warrior; if we revert to the Vedic ancestor of this ferocious creature, and see what joy in life as life is portrayed in battle-hymn and cattle-hymn, we shall be ready to admit, I think, that through the whole history of the Hindu, from the early Vedic until the pseudo-Epic period, there reigned the feeling, in the larger class of the native inhabitants, that existence is full of life and reality. I would not cavil at Müller's distinction, because it is plain he means that in general aspect such a difference is perceptible. But this is a difference that would fall to pieces, were we to eliminate the literary class, from whose works we form such a judgment. The Hindu soldier's view of existence must be got mainly by inference, for the priest has done his best to inspire the knight with the thoughts of the priest; but if we study even priestly delineations of military life, we shall see that philosophy and even religion lay far from the soldier's heart. His life was bent on the material things of this world, as was the farmer's. He was no dreamer, till the priest retouched his portrait

I turn now to a study of this warrior feeling. To subdue an enemy, three means are popularly quoted. Of these, the first is conciliation, the last is war. This introduces us fitly to the theoretical as opposed to the practical side of the military sentiment. As a matter of fact, 'conciliation' has little part to play in the early story; but in the later development of the Epic drama, the first means of attaining political ends is faithfully carried out.*

---

* Brihaspati, in xii. 69. 23, gives only conciliation, bribery, and dissension as the three legitimate means. But elsewhere we find other lists, making the 'means' four in number, or even more—five, or seven being adduced (compare ii. 5. 21, and ib. 61; Kām. Nīt. xvii. 3; x. 10; viii. 70). 'Polity' is made a means, as in v. 132. 31–32, where a king is thus exhorted to recover his kingdom: 'to beg is not allowed thee; to till the soil is shame; a knight thou art, and livest by might of arms alone; then take again thy kingdom, by any means thou canst—by

Peace is the ultimate goal of a happy kingdom; but throughout the Epic peace is presupposed as an anomaly in life. Constant strife, with insidious citizens and with open foes, must always be carried on. 'Through force and punishment is peace attained; no coward can do right; no coward does his duty. On the king depends all virtue; on virtue, heaven; on heaven, the gods; on gods, the rain; on rain, plants; on plants, men—that king who (by completing the causal nexus) is the creator of men is equal to ten learned priests. So says Manu' (i. 41. 28 ff.). For this oft-given reason the king is enjoined to recover a lost kingdom, or defend a threatened one, in any way he can. The kingdom belongs to him by hereditary right (*vañçabhojyam*), and he must never despair (iii. 78. 9; v. 136. 1). We find of course a number of platitudes against vengeance: 'The good think not of vengeance, but to do good to their enemies; the highest sort of men are patient' (ii. 73. 6 ff.). But the Epic heroes are (as Duryodhana is described to be) 'razor-hearted,' and let even their friends, as Vidura sadly remarks, be punished in their wrathful folly (i. 128. 46; ii. 64. 12). Vengeance is the mainspring of the whole drama. If the king is unable to subdue his foes openly, he must be a hypocrite and pretend love till the time is ripe for vengeance. This is the essence of royal polity in 'cases of distress' (xii. 140. 9 ff.). 'He must be suave and agreeable till he can crush his foe; he must pattern himself after the tricks of animals; like a cuckoo should he watch, like a boar should undermine, like a mountain be steadfast, and in all cases possess impassibility (*anullañghanīyatvam*), anxious to get good luck like an empty house; capable of many disguises like a player; now drawing himself in like a turtle, or being fierce as a wolf, swift as an arrow, etc., as occasion shall demand; trusting no one, but keeping himself informed by means of spies. No dry enmity, but fruitful hate, should be

---

kindness or dissension, by bribery, force, or guile (*kṣatriyo 'si kṣatāt trātā bāhuvīryopajīvitā*, etc.). The five are here *sāmnā bhedena dānena daṇḍenā 'tha nayena vā*; and *naya* is political intrigue. But in vi. 3. 81 we find pacification, dissension among foes, and open war quoted as the 'three means;' where, since 'numbers do not give victory,' the two first should be tried before the third. The regular three appear in v. 82. 13, and seem implied in v. 33. 62, where we read: *trayopāyāḥ . . . çrūyante . . . kanīyān madhyamaḥ çreṣṭhaḥ* (*iti vedavido viduḥ*), if we permit the commentator to read *upāyāḥ*, and to resolve into war, dissension and bribery (as one), and conciliation; but *apāyāḥ*, referring to desire, duty, and greed, may be the meaning, or *trayo nyāyāḥ* may be read (N. 7). Three means appears the oldest form; four means is a later idea, as kept in xii. 356. 6 (conciliation, dissension, bribery, force), and M. vii. 107–109. The pseudo-Epic also employs the *caturvidham* or 'four-fold means,' in a loose way, for means to any accomplishment, and makes the group refer thus to doing anything 'by sight, thought, voice, or act:' xii. 291. 16.

his; let him not use his arms when he can have a boat; let him not attempt the impossible, for it is no use trying to eat a cow's horn; but when he can, let him go straight to killing men, destroying houses, spoiling roads, and ruining his foe as best he may. Let him corrupt his foe's ministers, appeal to his own people's weaknesses, win the confidence of the heads of guilds, and endear his ministers by favoring their families. Only a learned priest he had best avoid to quarrel with, for long are the arms of a wise man; but otherwise, whatever foe he has, for that foe's destruction let him toil.'*

This mode of procedure is particularly for outward foes; but like means must guard against inward discontent, since the worst condition of 'distress' is where weak and low men have power in a kingdom (iii. 35. 17). No respect whatever is due to a king that does not somehow or other subdue his enemies. He sinks like a cow in the mud, and is helpless as an ant (iii. 35. 7; ii. 15. 11). With such teaching, the motto 'Peace I think the best thing' (ii. 15. 5) is a superfluous addition. There was no peace till all were crushed.

2. *The general fighting force and military sentiment.*—The whole business of the whole warrior caste was fighting. Members of other castes fought also. 'Except in some wildly supernatural legends,' says Wheeler (Hist. Ind. i. 77), 'the Brahmans are not represented as warriors.' He refers to Droṇa, the priestly warrior. But the legend is of great importance, and shows us plainly that it was conceived as possible, even if extraordinary, that a priest should be a leader in war. Another legend points to the fact that priests were only in the later time regarded as unfitted for martial practices. When the Pāndus go disguised to Krishnā's self-choosing, they assume the dress

---

* The allusion to the empty house is explained by the fact that a house not yet occupied is glad to have its first inmate make a lucky entrance; so the inception of his plan he should strive to have done under favorable auspices. The reference to the boat is drawn from an antique law forbidding a man (avoiding toll) to swim a river where a ferry has been placed. So a king should wait for the proper means to convey him to his goal (Compare Vās. xii. 45, *bāhubhyāṁ na nadīṁ taret*; M. iv. 77, etc.). The Manu code has also many of the comparisons drawn from the acts of animals. Compare vs. 24 with M. vii. 105; 25 (a) = M. vii. 106 (a), etc. The spies are here recommended as usual for parks, halls, and places where priests meet. Compare above, p. 152. The allusion to the cow's horn (*anarthakam anāyuṣyaṁ goviṣāṇasya bhakṣaṇam*, 56) is explained by the addition 'the teeth touch it, but no food is obtained.' Compare with these mottoes Kām. Nit. v. 1; Ag. P. 224. 27, etc. The heads of guilds mentioned in vs. 64 are the same as those already discussed above, p. 26. With vs. 69 ff. compare Böhtlingk's *Sprüche*, *mahate yo* and *na tat taret*; with the last proverb, 68, compare v. 37. 56; 38. 8.

of priests. As a priest Arjuna steps out and performs wonders with the bow. The warriors present are incensed that a priest can surpass them in shooting; but the incident shows the not impossible attitude of the priestly caste in respect of handling weapons. It is only after the deed is done that the angry and defeated warriors make a rule that no priest henceforth shall enter the lists to contend in feats of arms with the knights. In spite of Wheeler's cutting dismemberment of the poem, there remains nothing wildly supernatural or even improbable in this legend. Again, compare a king's universal challenge: 'Is there one that bears a weapon and is equal unto me in fight, either slave or farmer or knight or priest' (v. 96. 7). Even the son of Drona, who was one of the bitterest warriors in the Epic, retains so much of priestly character that he is reproached for using a weapon, and called a 'priest but in name:' an indication of the soldier-priest's rarity, but a proof of the circumstance that the priest still as priest (as member of the caste) fought on the field (see below, § 4). Further, it was the formal law that any priest might serve as a soldier if unable to support himself as a priest. In view of legend and law it seems wrong to say that 'priests are never represented as soldiers save in wildly improbable legends.' That one of the lawgivers disputes this law shows again that, while not universal, it was not uncommon.*

The mass of the army, the despised conglomerate array useful only for a wall, is composed of all the lowest castes, mixed with barbarians and foreigners. Among these too fought the men of the people-caste, when necessity called them into the field, as the quotation from a battle-chapter given below shows: where it is also stated, were the proof needed, that the slave too obtains heaven by fighting and dying in battle. In general, therefore, we may say, reverting to the earliest period, that first of all the whole people fought on the field; that in the Epic period the knights fought as the main soldiers; that some reminiscence remains even of the priests' use of arms; that the agricultural caste rarely but really fought in battle (against the statement of the Greek historians), and that the slave-caste with other un-Aryan elements of the state went to make up the projectile force as mass in the battle array, but were without individuality. No low man gets a reputation for bravery or even for cowardice. He is but a brick in a row. The common warriors, however, those unable to bear the expense of cars or good arms, were retainers of the kings and lords, and (probably according to their wealth or bravery) were appointed to the positions of under-officers, or led the van in charges.

---

* Compare G. vii. 6 (but see Bühler's Intr. p. lii); Vās. ii. 22; M. x. 81.

'The essence of warrior duty lies in fighting' is the hundred-times-repeated axiom and motto of all the caste. A few of their own expressions will show how deep a moral hold this law of their fighting caste had on the Hindus. It is indeed no ill to die in battle when one has been challenged to the fight; but forever noblest is the death of those that fight straightly and turn not aside.* Not a pleasure only, but the highest duty is it to die in war: 'Fight now, be firm; no other duty has a king than slaying foes' (v. 160. 71). No matter how challenged, the warrior must respond. So a suddenly challenged king answers at once to a peremptory challenge by speedy preparation: 'Mindful of the warrior's duty, he laid his crown aside and braided up his hair,' the formal beginning for the fight.†

In fact, it makes no difference whether one expects to kill or to be killed in the contest, he must fight; and in either case he gets his reward; for 'crooked is war always; who strikes, and is not struck again? But it is the same if one be slain or not, for he that dies in battle wins victory from death;'‡ for 'death in battle is the womb of heaven' (ii. 22. 18). Even the punning etymology of the word warrior is called upon to defend this view. Not to kill the foe is a sin; the warrior is called 'he that saves from destruction;§ therefore he lives by destruction.' All a warrior's superiority lies in force, as does the priest's in texts, the farmer's in wealth, and the slave's in his age alone (v. 168. 17). The same idea is often repeated.‖ 'Boldness alone is the hero's own law.' ¶ 'There is,' it is said again, 'absolutely no rule but conflict for one of the warrior caste' (iii. 35. 35). 'To escape is a disgrace; to die in battle is best; to ask for mercy is a sin; sweet is it to die in battle; the path to heaven lies in fighting.'** Wherever we find the topic touched, it is handled in the same way.†† One should fight strongly and unselfishly (*nirahaṁkāra*), for fighting is the eternal law; and one may slay an elder and a better who comes to attack him,[*] for one should 'show no mercy to the foe.' Such determination in warfare naturally gave rise to proverbial expressions embodying the comparison with others less bloody by nature.[†] It was even regarded not alone as a disgrace, but as a sin, for a warrior not to die (as we should say) 'in his boots.' 'To die of disease in a house is a sin' is more than once emphatically said (vi. 17. 11; xii. 97. 14–23). As a consequence of the necessity of battle, all caste-rules were laid aside. The knight might kill anyone that attacked him. Not even the priests were sacred.[‡] The psychical reason added to this rule might have applied to other cases, had the priests seen fit; for 'the soul is not killed; it seeks a new home;' and, after all, 'it is not the slayer that slays, but fate.'[§] So it is said distinctly 'if one sees a priest among those raising arms against him, a priest acting just like a warrior, and kills him when he is thus fighting, that is not 'priest-murder' at all: that is the decision in the works on duty.'[‖] This is a clear indication that the rules on duty found it necessary to provide for a very possible contingency by exculpating the slayer of a priest in advance.

---

* iii. 33. 16–17; *āhave*, so the verb *āhvayad dvāirathenā 'jāu*, xii. 5. 1 etc., 'called out' to a duel (see below in battle).

† *keçān samanugṛhya*, ii. 23. 5 ff.

‡ v. 72. 53, cf. ff. Compare R. vi. 93. 24–25; *parāir vā hanyate vīraḥ parān vā hanti saṁyuge, iyaṁ hi pūrvanirdiṣṭā gatiḥ kṣatriyaçāçvatī*, ff.

§ *kṣatatrātā kṣatāj jīvan*, vii. 197. 4, 38; 143. 66; above, p. 114.

‖ Compare ii. 21. 50 ff., and with 52 cf. v. 132. 7, the 'arm-power' of the warrior against 'voice-power' of the priests.

¶ *svako hi dharmaḥ çūrāṇāṁ vikramaḥ*; and if the 'three means' fail, conquer by boldness, i. 202. 18.

** iv. 38. 29; v. 3. 20 ff.; 185. 11; viii. 93. 55 ff. = ix. 19. 63 (ib. 59 = ib. 64).

†† The exhortations just before the great war opens are not more expressive than those in mid-fight. They all breathe the same spirit, that it is pleasant and holy to die fighting, and that this assures heaven hereafter. 'The best death is on the field of battle;' 'either victory or a battle-death—this is the eternal law proclaimed by the creator,' (v. 51. 51; 73. 4; ix. 31. 34). Compare also v. 75. 23: 'a warrior does not own what he does not win by his strength' (*yad ojasā na labhate kṣatriyo*

So overwhelming appears to the Epic poet the moral force back of the warrior's physical might that we have one sad statement in respect of that might: 'Right is that which a strong man understands to be right.'[¶] Above all, the natural mourn-

---

*na tad açnute*), for what he does win belongs to him, except for the share deducted for the king. Compare M. vii. 96–97 and G. x. 20–23: the victor has all the spoils of battle except cars and riding-animals, which fall to the king; as does also a special share of all the booty saving what a knight has thus gained by a duel; all other things won in battle are divided among the army; compare also Kām. Nīt. xix. 21. Death in some holy spot is particularly desirable, such as '*kurukṣetra*, the all-holy' (v. 141. 53). 'To fight as long as life shall last, to bow to priests and duty' is the summary of a warrior's code (v. 134. 40; 127. 15 ff). Sometimes the priest comes after duty, as ib. 127. 20. This is a perverted quotation.

[*] vi. 122. 37; 107. 101 ff.: the Divinity speaks.

[†] xii. 14–15; 22. 4; iii. 22. 23; 27. 37, 39; 28. 7; v. 38. 29: conversely we find 'tender-hearted as a priest' (iii. 35. 20).

[‡] For 'wrath obtains wrath' as its reward. This is the proverbial *ātatāyin* doctrine kept in the law-codes, of which different forms exist: xii. 15. 55; 34. 19; 56. 30; iii. 29. 27; M. viii. 351; Āp. 1. 10. 29. 7, quoted from a Purāṇa; Vās. iii. 17; B. i. 18. 13. It refers to a secret assassin or an open foe. Curious is *manyus tam manyum ṛcchati* = ἔρις δ' ἔριν ἀντιφυτεύει, Pseudo-Phocyl. 78.

[§] 'Fate I deem the highest thing; manliness is no avail,' ii. 47. 36, etc.; v. 159. 4, 14, 'man is worked by fate like a wooden machine' (*dāruyantravat*).

[‖] v. 178. 51; note the conclusion: one may act toward another as that other acts toward him (53).

[¶] ii. 69. 15: said by Bhīshma.

ing for the dead is forbidden. Formal mourning with appropriate rites is fit service at the funeral of a warrior; but one should not lament long in his heart for those that are slain in battle. First, because he that does so 'gets only woe on woe,' since fighting and being slain is to the warrior what penance is to the priest and service to the slave, and the dead have obtained happiness; next, because one should console himself by himself, and not allow useless grief to cloud his mind; naught is better to the warrior than war; to avoid it is to lose place on earth and in heaven; to flee is un-Aryan, ungodly.*

So, in spite of some melancholy objection to death, and the thought that posthumous fame is no better than 'a wreath

---

*xi. 2. 20; 9: 21 ff.; 26. 4 ff.; xv. 31. 4; ix. 31. 24. These passages are easily multiplied. I select but a few of epigrammatic or special moral interest: 'We know not whether death comes by day or by night; but this we know—that nothing immortal lies in peace' (ii. 17. 2). 'The palace of Indra is for them that seek their death in battle' (ii. 12. 21). 'For war was the warrior born, victor or vanquished he goes to Indra's heaven' (v. 135. 13). 'A knight's rule is "the weapon forever;" he should not seek to be a priest; for Indra was a warrior, and slew his sinful kin' (xii. 22. 5 ff: although in the same book Vasishtha has to exhort Indra to 'make up his mind like an Aryan and slay his foes,' ib. 282. 24). 'A pious priest and a warrior dying face to the foe both (attain the same end, and) split the disk of the sun' (v. 33. 61). 'Face to the foe—who dies thus, endless his heaven' (iii. 54. 18). 'Do not grieve, my friends,' says even the sinful Duryodhana, 'for if the Vedas be any rule to you, I have conquered the world to come, in that I have not swerved from knightly law' (ix. 65. 28 ff.: cf. iii. 52. 25, *yadi vedāḥ pramāṇāḥ*) So it is said (xi. 26. 12 ff.): 'They that die slaughtered (by chance) go to worlds of gods and kings; they that die with the thought "I will die" join the angels; they that hold out against all odds, these go to the home of Brahma; while even those that have begged for mercy, if they still die with their faces to the foe, go to the *guhyaka* world; moreover, those that die anyhow on the field of battle, even if killed by accident (not slaughtered by the sword), go to the Kurus of the North after death' (12: *hutāni çarīrāṇi* B., *hatāni* C. 767: cf. xii. 98).

The hero-king of the Epic is told that he may make his mind easy for the slaughter of so many human creatures by performing a penance —'even a little penace,' it is contemptuously added. The whole passage shows disdain for the weak sorrow of a king who could grieve for the deaths caused by his glorious wars, and adduces the constant argument that a king should 'protect:' or, as here applied, should 'protect his rights;' for the king's duty is to slay anyone that turns right into wrong, even if it be a son or a priest; the axe is not the slayer of the tree it is the woodman; the king is not the slayer of the men that die in battle, it is fate; even the gods once filled the earth with bloody oceans, when they fought with the demons; if it lies on the king's conscience that many have been slain for his sake, let him do penance; or, if he will, let him perform the great horse-sacrifice, which will certainly relieve his soul of all evil (xii. 32. 2 ff.—33. 25; 97. 1 ff.: cf. ib. 23, 'it is a sin to die in bed,' and, therefore, a virtue to die in battle). The metaphor of the ocean of blood is elsewhere fully carried out. Compare the battle-scenes below, or e. g. xii. 55. 18: the bodies are islands; the flags, the sea-foam; one waters earth with blood; grasses it with hair; hills it with corpses.

adorning a dead man,'* the usual and effective spurs to courage are duty and glory. 'I elect glory even at the cost of life,' says the Kurus' chief hero;† for 'victory is the root of right, and death is better than lack of fame.'‡ But fear inspired courage also; for according to the Epic rule a deserter is killed, and may even be burned to death.§

The question naturally arises, how far the formal expression of opinion reflects here the true spirit of the soldiers. To this the answer is, as it seems to me, that the chiefs are rightly represented as preferring death to defeat, and as delighting in the fierce shedding of blood; while the masses need these exhortations to encourage them. Every hero, of course, because he is a hero, exults in the battle; only the king of the Pāndus, by what in each case appears to be interpolation, is made to grieve and sorrow over the result of war; and the greatest knight, Arjuna, is made to feel a moral fear of killing before the fight begins.

But the common soldiers, for the most part mercenary troops, are supplied with these sentiments as exhortative pills to stimulate their slower valor; and, too, oftentimes in vain. That almost Mohammedan outburst referred to above ('sweet it is to die in battle; the path to heaven lies in fighting,' viii. 93. 55 ff.) is the last desperate call of a great chief seeking to rally his frightened troops. But the call has absolutely no effect; it does not stimulate the churls behind him to love of glory at the expense of life. They run away. As we shall presently see, this is no exception to the general order of events. The true warrior by caste is really indoctrinated with these sentiments to such an extent that he willingly dies for glory's sake as well as for duty's; but the mass of the army was cowardly, trumped to battle at the outset, and eagar to avoid danger whenever it arose.‖

Interesting as the exhibition of *morale* given by the quotations above may be (and it seems to me that the poets have enabled us to get a tolerably clear idea of this, and portrayed the fighting force with what we may assume to be a true imitation of the actual conditions obtaining in Hindu warfare), it only brings out the more strongly our lack of information in regard to the real war-life of the king's common soldiers. What we do know may be briefly recapitulated here, before we proceed to the subject of military tactics. As to the primitive Hindu soldier of the pre-Epic period, how he was supported, what he did in peace, etc., we know next to nothing save by inference, and by works too late to be considered as valid for the Epic period. We judge that his pay was a part of the booty; that at first he was a fraction of the common folk, and in peace was not different from his neighbors; tending cattle, offering sacrifice, repelling assaults, making forays, as times and wishes twirled his inclination. But gradually the cattle were left to others that preferred a quiet life; agriculture arose, and caste gratings separated thenceforth and forever the hired soldiers from the ranchman and the farmer. Now he belonged wholly to the king, and drew his pay from his valor, or, later still, from a regular stipend, plus what (with certain exceptions) his individual bravery enabled him to seize as private booty on the field of war. In the Epic period (and the reports of the Greeks support the native authorities) he lives a life in part beautifully resembling that of the German soldier. In war he fights as he is bid. In peace he amuses himself, and does nothing else. He receives a regular wage (which ought to be paid in advance), but is not employed by the king on the strength of this support to attend to civil business. His life must be free from business affairs, and his wife is supported by a pension when he is slain. His position theoretically is inferior only to the priest's, and in social practice inferior also only to his aristocratic superiors of the same caste.*

---

* iii. 301. 7; *mṛtasya kīrtir martyasya yathā mālā gatāyuṣaḥ.*

† iii. 300. 31: *vṛṇomi kīrtiṁ loke hi jīvitenā 'pi.*

‡ xii. 100. 39–40.

§ xii. 97. 22. The same kind of punishment with the same kind of fire is here decreed for the deserter as that which the law-codes enjoin for a warrior or man of the people-caste that has dishonored a woman of the priestly caste. Compare Vās. xxi. 1–3; M. viii. 377 (*kaṭāgninā*).

‖ As I have already observed, the common soldiers are led into the battle on the principle that quantity is more important than quality. 'An army with a mass of foot soldiers becomes solid' (*padātibahulā senā dṛḍhā bhavati*), xii. 100. 24 (or *çatrūñ jayati* in Ag. P. 227. 7): cf. Epic, ib. 99. 18, *na hi çāuryāt param; sarvaṁ çūre pratiṣṭhitam.*

---

*These points, incidentally touched on already, may be illustrated by the following: 'the daily allowance and (monthly) wage of the army to be paid as stipulated and at the time agreed upon' (*kaccid balasya bhaktaṁ ca vetanaṁ ca yatho 'citam, samprāptakāle dātavyaṁ adāsi na vikarṣasi*, ii. 5. 48, and the same in R. ii. 109. 41); 'support the wives of those that for your sake have gone to death' (ii. 5. 54: cf. xii. 86. 24; cf. also Nītipra. vi. 106–107); 'one must not engage in business affairs with a king's soldier' (*rājabhṛtyaḥ . . . . senājīvī ca . . . vyavahāreṣu varjanīyāḥ*, v. 37. 30). The rules for booty have been given above. Ease and pleasure were the fruits of peace. Compare the Greek's account (Diodor. xli.: πέμπτον δὲ στρατιωτικὸν, εἰς τοὺς πολέμους εὐθετοῦν, τῷ μὲν πλήθει δεύτερον, ἀνέσει δὲ καὶ παιδιᾷ πλείστῃ χρώμενον ἐν ταῖς εἰρήναις Τρέφεται δ' ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῶν πολεμιστῶν. ἵππων τε καὶ ἐλεφάντων. Arrian, Ind. xii., fills this out a little: πέμπτον δὲ γένος ἐστὶν 'Ινδοῖσιν οἱ πολεμισταὶ, πλήθεϊ μὲν δεύτερον μετὰ τοὺς γεωργοὺς, πλείστῃ δὲ ἐλευθερίῃ τε καὶ εὐθυμίῃ ἐπιχρεόμενον· καὶ οὗτοι ἀσκηταὶ μούνων τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων εἰσί. He adds that they make their own arms and have servants to attend them in camp, and proceeds: αὐτοὶ δὲ ἔστ' ἂν μὲν πολεμέει δέῃ πολεμέουσιν, εἰρήνης δὲ γενομένης εὐθυμέονται· καί σφιν μισθὸς ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ τοσόςδε ἔρχεται ὡς καὶ ἄλλους τρέφειν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εὐμαρέως. Compare Strabo, above p. 68

3. *Military Tactics.*—The formal account of possible military manœuvres given in the Manavic code is, as compared with the Epic, both redundant and deficient. Enough remains of exact similarity to show that the code speaks of movements well authorized by tradition as by precept. Probably both the Manavic law and the Epic are indebted for their full facts to the military codes published by the two greatest authorities on such matters, Brihaspati and Uçanas. That is to say, the completing Epic supplied itself with descriptions from the usually recognized possibilities of warfare, and the Manavic code copied the current military rules (*yuddhadharma*) ascribed to these men, and which may well have been existent in some form or other (as a manual) before our present Manu was composed.

If the king is resolved on going out to attack a neighboring kingdom, he should make the expedition, if he can select his time, either in the moon corresponding to the time from the middle of November to the middle of December, or during the two moons from the middle of February to the middle of March.* These are the months most suitable for a campaign; but he should not regard this as a rule. He may go, adds the pseudo-Epic, at any other time, if it suits his purpose better.† In what way the line of march is to be taken up we are not particularly told. The army advances in an irregular body, led by the chief generals, the king being in the middle. The baggage-wagons and provision-wagons and the women

---

With this account from Megasthenes it is interesting to compare Tacitus: Quotiens bella non ineunt, multum venatibus plus per otium transigunt, dediti somno ciboque. Fortissimus quisque nihil agens delegata domus et penatium et agrorum cura feminis senibusque et infirmissimo cuique ex familia; ipsi hebent; mira diversitate naturæ, cum iidem homines sic ament inertiam et oderint quietem (G. 15). Holtzmann (Epos, s. 5, with notes) has compared many of the points wherein the Hindu Epic 'is often the best commentary on the Germania.' There are so many points of contact between the ethnographic description of the Germania and the life of the Hindu, both in the original texts and in what remains of Megasthenes, that the question has risen in my mind whether Tacitus, in representing an ideal opposed to the rank life of the Roman Imperial period (as some have assumed to be the cause of his writing), did not fill out his lacunæ of information with the reports of an equally foreign and more unknown folk, and help himself from the descriptions of Megasthenes (of which we have now but part). The position of the great chiefs, the fondness for dice, the description of the soldier-life, all correspond. What information concerning the Germans the writer really had would supersede the worth of imagination or of borrowing. Where he had none, he might have borrowed.

* The Pāndus sent their embassy to the Kurus in the month *kāumuda*, after fall. It was seven days before the new moon when the ambassador, failing to procure terms of peace, agreed that hostilities should begin when the seven days were over: v. 83. 7; 142. 18.

† xii. 100. 9 ff.: cf. ib. 69. 20; M. vii. 182; Nītiprak. vii. 51; Ag. P. 227. 6. The passage here quoted from the later Epic gives details on roads, the suitable ground for horses to fight on, etc.

follow. The headquarters of the king are guarded by troops stationary and movable. Behind come other generals.* On arriving at the place where the conflict is likely to take place, the king or commander encamped the army (*niveçaṁ kārayāmāsa* or *niveçayāmāsa senām*) upon a level place of broad extent, and the soldiers pitched their tents (*veçā*); while the headquarters of the general commander (*skandhāvāra*) were guarded by squads of men (*gulmāḥ*), as on a march. The first care was to clear the ground, and for this purpose, any outlying posts of the enemy (*sāinikā gulmāḥ*) having been driven off, the commander with the help of his generals had the camp limits marked out (*çibiram māpayāmāsa*), and a trench dug about it (*khānayāmāsa parikhām*), which, for the sake of greater protection (*guptyartham*), was guarded by troops. The camp itself (*çibira* or *senāniveça*) consisted of separated tents stored with arms.† Such a camp is described as looking like a city; and if, as is probable, the

---

*v. 151. 50 ff. In the abstract of this portion of my paper as already reported (Proceedings, May, 1887), I have suggested that the Manavic orders of march really refer to battle-arrays. They do, but I should have put the case differently. What is described in the Manavic code is a series of battle-arrays and at the same time of march-arrays. In other words, the law-book implies that, from the time the king leaves his capital, he shall draw out his forces in full preparation for conflict. Thinking of long marches, I overlooked this possibility, and was thence led to believe that the 'battle-arrays' of the code were only for the field of conflict with instant prospect of fighting. And in fact the fighting is supposed to be immediate. All is here described as on a battle-field. Hence an imminent foe must be intended, and the 'march' is from its beginning an advance against a possibly instantaneous attack. *Vyūha* is, I think, not used for a long march. *Senāyoga* or *yātrā* is the proper term for that (or *yātrikam*, xii. 100. 10; 69. 20; 103, 40). Thus, in v. 151. 56, we find an irregular body of the Pāndus advancing (*prayātānām*) toward Kurukshetra, their only care being to keep the king in the middle. But when they arrive on the field, they are spread out at once in a *vyūha*, which is not the case before (*āsādya tu kurukṣetraṁ vyūḍhānīkāḥ prahāriṇaḥ, pāṇḍavaḥ samadṛçyanta nardanto vṛṣabhā iva*, ib. 68). So in xv. 7. 12 ff. the king is first to march (*yātrāṁ gacchet*), and then to set his army before the foe in proper order, using the 'wagon,' 'lily,' or 'thunderbolt' array, as explained by Uçanas. Compare also R. ii. 90. 12, 19; 87. 1, 4, where the general-in-chief goes in advance on a march; and roadmakers, ditch-diggers, machine-makers, etc., etc., go before the army to facilitate the journey. I said that *mārga* was manœuvre in the Manavic passage. I was wrong; it is the route; used as e. g. the word appears in the story of Rāma, Mbh. iii. 283. 40; 291. 60, and in R. ii. 90. 32, *çāstradṛṣṭena mārgeṇa*. But here, too, the route is taken by the army arranged as if for battle; for such is the meaning of the following words: *bṛhaspatinayena ca*, 'according to the rule of Brihaspati' (explained below).

† Bows, bowstrings, corselets, swords, honey, butter, lac, fodder, arrows, axes, spears, quivers, besides ponderous machines, are prominent among the stores of the camp. The use of some of these will be described below. Chariots, armed elephants, etc., are in all parts of the camp.

poet does not exaggerate in saying that, besides the fighting men, all the artizans, bards, traders, and prostitutes deemed necessary had also their residence inside the camp-limits, we may well believe the comparison corresponds to truth.* Watch-words and secret signals by which friends may be recognized are given out before the battle begins (*abhijñānāni* or *saṁjñāḥ*, vi. 1. 11 ff.). Fighting does not begin till morning. The array for the day is decided upon, and the troops advance, being in general stationed in such propinquity that each soldier shall feel himself surrounded by his own relatives: that is, as far as possible, the clan and family divisions are to be observed. 'Death in a house is not approved of in the case of warriors; that would be destructive of the pride of proud heroes; that would be wrong and pitiable indeed; . . . such a death ought no hero (*vīraḥ*) to endure. But a warrior ought to die causing destruction in the ranks of war, surrounded by his kin, hewn down by sharp weapons. . . . Fired by love and pride, a true hero dies thus, and goes to Indra's heaven.'† It is also worthy of note that, before the advance to the field of conflict, a religious fire-service is performed. This ceremony is doubtless the same on the part of the Kurus as that alluded to as performed by the Pāndus: viz., a devotion of the foes to destruction over a war-fire. Probably we are to understand a formal rite, in which the gods are called upon to destroy the foes of the sacrificer. The ceremony is performed by the family-priest of the Pāndus.‡

The special tactics employed on entering the field will now be given, and then the use of arms. These subjects should be studied solely by the light of the military movements described in the Epic.* The 'arrays' mentioned by the earlier code of Manu, however, correspond so closely to the Epic usage that for preliminary understanding of the term the legal forms may be here mentioned.† The army may be formed into an oblong column; a wedge; a rhombus; a body like two triangles with apices joined (the bases forming the van and rear); one long slender line; a rhomboid with extended sides;[*] one long heavy phalanx. One should encamp in a circle, with the king in the center.[†]

---

* v. 151. 58; 152. 1 ff.; 161. 1; 195. 12 ff. Five *yojanas* is the size of the Kurus' camp (ib. 15).

† *raṇeṣu kadanaṁ kṛtvā jñātibhiḥ parivāritaḥ, tikṣṇāiḥ çastrāir abhikliṣṭaḥ kṣatriyo mṛtyum arhati*, xii. 97. 28 ff.; *çauṭīra* (25), *vīra* (27), *çūra* (29). In vi. 94. 37 also *jñātibhiḥ parivāritaḥ*.

‡ v. 195. 1 ff. Compare v. 126. 2; and *purohitāḥ çatruvadhaṁ vadantaḥ*, in vi. 22. 7. The first passage represents the Kurus marching out to the field against the Pāndus, adorned with garlands and clothed in white (verse 2). Like the Spartans, the Hindu soldiers were careful to attend to their hair before a battle, binding it up about their heads. As a further preliminary, they arrange their beards (or shave, *kḷptaçmaçru*), viii. 58. 33. Compare the ceremony (repeating Vedic verses) enjoined in Āçvalāyana (G. S. iii. 12. 1 ff.) for the Purohita to perform when the king goes into battle. I may mention in this connection that the king instead of the priest may say the verses (ib. 20); and that the only *vyūhas* known are those of Āditi and Uçanas (ib. 16), if this lies in the words *ādityam āuçanasaṁ vā 'vasthāya prayodhayet* (*āsthāya* is the Epic word). The Ait. Br. has directions for consecrating the chariot as a means of victory (viii. 10; Weber, *Ind. Stud.* x. 31). In later times compare Ag. P. 125. 49 ff., a fire-sacrifice at the beginning of battle to insure victory, where animals are sacrificed (*juhuyān* (*nṛ-?*) *māṅsam*, 50).

---

* And not by the darkness of later formal codes on war. The materials for Hindu antiquities must, it seems to me, first be drawn exclusively from the classical or older literature, and not from the late didactic works until the Epic has declared itself. Such modern explanatory books as the 'Politys' form, on account of the difference in age and the wholly theoretical character of the contents, rather an obscuration than an elucidation of the facts we seek. They are instructive only as illustrating the Epic, and help us when they confirm the data drawn from real literature; but when they contradict such data, they are to be ignored—unless one seeks to form a continuous chain from the Epic period to the latest age, and to do so will arrange the didactic material after that drawn from the Epic. But to confound and mix the two, to quote a Nīti on military matters as if entitled to like consideration with the Epic, is to allow a succeeding age to interpret a former, and ignore a possible development bridging the two. Thus, besides the simple Epic sprinkling of the king at the consecration, the universal 'sprinkling' of all the king's arms, the *nīrājanāvidhi* (Ag. P. 267 ff.), the raising of the *daṇḍa*, so elaborately described with the triumphal arch and lustration in Bṛh. Saṁh., chap. 43–45, have no meaning for the Epic period, interesting as they are for that of the Harivañça and following epochs. Thus also it is from no wish to exclude outside aid that I here put aside the technical divisions of the Nītisāra of Kāmandaki and of the Nītiprakāça; but a glance will show the Epic student what false guides these are. Everything is here on a modern footing. The older order has been not only increased but changed. The formal divisions of arms, arrays, employments do not accord with the more ancient records. I regard such works (including the Agni Purāṇa) as useful solely for giving us light on a later period; and, while thinking an interesting parallel to the Epic to be worth noting, do not consider the statements of such literature, when more detailed, as explanatory of the Epic; nor, when opposed, as authoritative. The four great divisions of the Nīti's *vyūhas* have no parallel in the Epic; and e. g. the *çyena* as a subdivision of the *daṇḍa* is misleading; nor are the names of the divisions, *daṇḍa*, *bhaga*, *asaṁhata*, *maṇḍala* (Nītiprak. vi. 3 ff.), known as such to the Epic; while the relegation of the *varāha*, *makara*, *gāruḍa*, *krāuñca*, *padma* to an extra class not contained under any head is merely a reflex of the fact that these are among those established by Epic tradition. Details, like those on the size of the *daṇḍa* (Ag. P. 61. 35 ff.), do not necessarily oppose the Epic, but may be quoted only as modern specifications. So, too, of the Bṛhat Saṁhitā. My objections to this class of literature I explain rather fully, since it might well be asked what need, in the light of Wilson's work and the texts published by later editors, we have of another investigation on military matters, especially on arms, etc. It is sufficient to say that, if we follow even Wilson's results, who has based his researches on the imitative Purāṇas, we obtain many statements contradicted by the usage of the Epic. It is the latter that is most important. Still greater discrepancies occur in comparing the formal war-codes with our poem. In each case the codes reflect a later period, although they have of course inherited much that is old and common with the didactic parts of the older work.

† M. vii. 187 ff. For later works, compare Ag. P. 235 (*raṇadīkṣā*) ff.: Kām. Nīt. xix. (seventeen forms are given); and Nītiprak. vi. 3–9.

To return to the Epic: At sunrise, or before, the king holds a short conference with the commander-in-chief, and either selects a battle-array himself, or directs the commander to do so. There is of course at times a doubt as to which form is preferable; and we find in one instance that the king himself insists on the long and slender line, while his best knight recommends the solid phalanx; for the chief officers are present at the conference. There seem to be no party or national orders. Each side selects one of the current forms, occasionally choosing one day the form that defeated them when chosen by the other the day before. If anticipated, the commander scrutinizes the foe's orders before deciding his own. After a selection has been made. the troops advance in different companies and regiments.[‡] We must pause here to ask what is the assumed distribution of the forces. We have, according to tradition, two different arithmetical progressions in differentiating the number of forces in the various bodies. According to a report which seems entirely theoretical (xii. 100. 31), the men are subdivided into groups of a thousand with a general at the head; of a hundred with a captain; of ten with a sergeant. This bears a close resemblance to the distribution of royal officers throughout the realm, the names being similar. In the one case we have 'a lord of a thousand villages,' 'lord of one hundred,' and 'lord of ten;' in the other 'lord of a thousand men,' etc. This distribution is not known in the fighting scenes, but neither is the following; and we can draw no definitive results as to the antiquity of division in either case. Vasishtha's division (see the note below) would imply that a decimal arrangement was the base of the army's make-up. The other arithmetical progression is mainly by three, instead of ten. Here we also find that the names designating the different bodies are not known as such, technically speaking, in the battle-scenes. What is called a company may mean a whole division or a whole army. Moreover, the numbers are in quantity absurd, when we remember that the Kurus are said to have put upon the field eleven times the highest number in the list, which should make an army of more than two hundred thousand chariots, as many elephants, more than a million men, and over half a million horses. Such exaggeration is, however, common in the Epic; and, by comparing several accounts of the numbers wounded in different cases, it will be seen that we often have to divide by a hundred or a thousand to reach a reasonable limit. The same absurdity is repeated at the end of our war. After almost countless hosts had been slain, the poor remnant on each side was as follows: On the Kuru side there remained eleven thousand chariots, ten thousand seven hundred elephants, fully two hundred thousand horses, and thirty million men.* The Pāndu army (originally seven 'whole armies') now consisted of six thousand chariots, as many elephants, ten thousand horses, and ten million foot-soldiers. Such was the *balaṁ çeṣam*, 'remnant,' on the morning of the last day (ix. 8. 41.). The opening forces are found in as extraordinary sums; where, to instance only one case, the number of *vaçavartinaḥ* (or soldiers brought into the field by one ally) implies one hundred thousand chariots (vi. 17 and 18). The systematic scheme of what an army is to be can, therefore, be looked upon only as a very late attempt to make technical divisions of which the true Epic knows nothing. The list may, however, be of interest. The name of the force stands to the left.

---

[*] Bühler's translation of the Manavic verse.

[†] *Daṇḍa, çakaṭa, varāha, makara, çūcī, garuḍa, vajra, padma*, literally 'staff, wagon, boar, sea-beast, needle, huge bird, thunderbolt, lily,' are given as names of arrays, and the last of camp order.

[‡] The commander 'draws up the order' (*vyūhaṁ cakre*), or draws up 'a counter-order' (against that of the foes, *prativyūha*). Drawn up, the foe is *vyūḍhānīka*, 'with face (acies) in battle order.' It is usual to 'counter against the foe' (*çatrūn prativyūhya*), though the verb absolute is also common (cf. vii. 6. 8; 19. 38). One draws out the different acies: cf. v. 164. 4, *anīkāni vyakarṣata*.

| | | Chariots. | Elephants. | Foot-men. | Horses (cavalry-men). |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *patti* | = | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| *senāmukha* | = | 3 | 3 | 15 | 9 |
| *gulma* | = | 9 | 9 | 45 | 27 |
| *gaṇa* | = | 27 | 27 | 135 | 81 |
| *vāhinī* | = | 81 | 81 | 405 | 243 |
| *pṛtanā* | = | 243 | 243 | 1215 | 729 |
| *camū* | = | 729 | 729 | 3645 | 2187 |
| *anīkinī* | = | 2187 | 2187 | 10935 | 6561 |
| *akṣāuhiṇī* | = | 21870 | 21870 | 109350 | 65610 |

Each division is thrice its preceding, except in the last example, where the *ākṣāuhiṇī* or complete army is ten times the *anīkinī*. Other authorities make *gulma* the same as *gaṇa*, and *senāmukha* also thrice its present size. But even the Epic itself formally contradicts this division, and makes one army-corps (*senā*) consist of five hundred elephants and the same number of chariots; while ten of these make a *pṛtanā*; and ten of these, a *vāhinī*; the *patti* has five and fifty men; the

---

* Literally, 'three *koṭis* of foot-men' (*pattikoṭyas tathā tisraḥ*): cf. R. vi. 4. 56, *çataṁ çatasahasrāṇāṁ koṭim āhur manīṣiṇaḥ*. *Patti* must here be the foot-soldier. There would thus be more men at the end of the war than at the beginning.

*gulma*, one hundred and sixty-five; three *gulmas* make a *gaṇa;* and there is no difference between a *patti* and a *senāmukha.** We have here a mixture of three and ten multiples. The earliest mention of formal army-divisions in the codes appears to point to a squad of ten factors as the unit of measurement; these factors being perhaps, as above, cavalrymen, foot-soldiers, war-car, and elephant: though no explanation of the 'ten' is given in the rule of Vasishtha containing this division.†

The Epic proper has, however, no definite terminology for divisions of the army. The same force has different names. Certain appellations denote a relatively large force; certain others, a relatively small one. Any of the names of the larger divisions may indicate the whole army without distinction. The only formal division recognized is that of the four-fold array; not a quantitative, but a qualitative distribution. 'The four-fold army,' everywhere alluded to as such in the early Epic, consists of an army divided according to kind into four groups: of foot-men, horse, chariot, and elephant (the last three implying those that ride on them). Further characteristics of these groups will be spoken of below.*

---

* v. 155. 24 ff.; the table above is from i. 2. 19 ff.

† I do not understand how 'one elephant, one chariot, two horsemen, and three foot-soldiers' make 'ten parts,' and, as I have not the text of the commentator, must suppose a clerical error in Bühler's note to Vās. xix. 17. While the first-mentioned method of dividing the army into groups of regiments, companies, and squads (of one thousand, one hundred, and ten men respectively), each with its commander (*adhīpati;* the commander of one thousand being also called *çūra*), appears a late invention, it may, nevertheless, be based on an old unit of ten. If we compare the words of Vasishtha (*saṁyāne daçavāhavāhinī dviguṇakāriṇī syāt*) with the late Epic distribution of officers, in which all those that can divide the foe's force and re-establish their own disbanded force are counted equal and worthy of eating and drinking together, and receiving double pay (*dviguṇavetanāḥ*), as applicable to all officers; and then find certain special officers called 'leaders of ten' (*daçādhipatayaḥ*), 'leaders of a hundred,' etc.—we might almost be tempted to transfer the meaning here to Vasishtha's words, and translate *vāha* as 'dux': 'in an attack (*saṁyāne*), the army led by its leaders of ten shall be employed in the double (duty of breaking the foe's ranks and holding its own).' But this may seem far-fetched, and leaves no better meaning for the next verse than we had before; whereas, if we take *vāha* as squad (=*patti*), with Bühler, we may give a better sense to 18 (*pratyekam prapāḥ syuḥ*) by reading (instead of *prapāḥ*) *pragāḥ*, authorized by Pāṇini, and a natural error in writing, and rendering 'and each squad shall have its fore-fighters,' which was the practice in actual battle (compare *purogama*). The following verse of Vasishtha (*puṁsāṁ çatāvarārdhyaṁ cā 'havayet*) I take as an indication that the division of one hundred was the next to the division of ten in his system. I ought to add, however, that *prapāḥ* is authorized by the like Epic text, xii. 69. 58. The passage above from the Epic gives us the word (*bala-*) *mukhyāḥ* 'captains' as the general term for officers, and shows us in the following verses that the king ought to call these men together (*mukhyān sannipātya*) and exhort them before the battle (xii. 100. 30–32).

---

* The four-fold army (*balaṁ caturaṅgam* or *vāhinī caturaṅginī* or *-sāinya*, e. g. i. 69. 4; v. 5. 17; ib. 19. 1; vii. 164. 9; iv. 68. 13: in iv. 52. 17 *caturbhāga* is merely a quarter of the army) is composed of all the men making the day's battle-order: *vihito vyūhaḥ padātyaçvarathadvipāiḥ* (vii. 20. 14, cf. 9). In later portions the army is spoken of as 'six-fold' (*ṣaḍaṅginī*), where to the fighting force is added the 'treasure' and 'machines,' brought to the camp (*koça* and *yantra*, (M. vii. 185; Mbh. v. 96. 16; xii. 103. 38), although the two additions are by some commentators explained as the 'general and workmen,' or even 'carts and camels:' thus showing the lateness of the change (compare the commentators on Manu, loc. cit.) In the Puranic literature we have four- or six-fold indifferently (Var. P. 10. 61; 27. 12; Ag. P. 10. 7; 14. 9; 241. 2, etc.), but generally four-fold. In the battle-scenes (below) the army is assumed to be four-fold. An eight-fold division of all the forces is given in xii. 121. 44 (compare below, and above p. 47). A three-fold division (*trividham balaṁ*) is only found of force, not forces (i. e. the realm's resources in council, wealth, and officers: ii. 5. 57). Unexplained by our text is 'the army of four-fold forces composed of eight members,' but the commentator thus explains this *aṣṭāṅgasaṁyuktā caturvidhabalā camūḥ* (ii. 5. 63, with which compare xv. 7. 7: *māula, mitra, aṭavībalam, bhṛtam, çreṇībalam*): 'the "four-fold force" means the native veterans (*māula*), the allied troops (*māitra*), the hired men (servants, slaves, etc., *bhṛtya*), and foresters (who help clear the roads, etc., *āṭavika*). The army, again, is distributed into eight parts, chariots, elephants, horses, fighters (*yodhāḥ*, i. e. all but the foot?), foot-soldiers, workmen, spies, and topographical leaders (those that can tell about places, *dāiçikamukhyāḥ*).' A comparison of the epithets given to the army in the Rāmāyaṇa shows that the 'four-fold' army is here also the more common, if not the only term employed (*caturaṅgabala:* R. i. 23. 14; *aṅga* or *aṅginī* also ib. i. 71. 3, 6; 76. 6; 78. 3; 79. 26; ii. 33. 7; 36. 2; 48. 7; 73. 11; 78. 22; 86. 13; 94. 9; (100. 54, *camū*;) 106. 9; iii. 42. 18; v. 78. 12; 81. 23; in 83. 2 defined *ṣaḍaṅginī:* i. 52. 21, v. l. Bomb. 51. 21: *varūthinī*). Comparing M. vii. 185 and Kām. Nīt. 18. 2, 22, we see that this last division of 'six' is not unknown to late Epic and later literature; but it is very rare against the common use of 'four.' The comparison points again (as I have shown on another theme) to the synchronic completion of the Manavic code and the Çāntiparvan of the Epic. The commander's proper title is *senāpati;* his office is *sāināpatya*. The title *vāhinīpati* is, however, common. The whole army is designated by *camū* ('four-fold') as well as by the proper name. Thus, Dhritarāshtra's whole force of eleven *akṣāuhiṇī* is called *vīratamā mahācamūḥ* (viii. 60. 92; ix. 64. 9). Other irregular names for the whole army are found vi. 72. 34 (*vāhinī*); vi. 112. 2 (*pṛtanā*); vi. 73. 22 (*varūthinī*). For *camū* compare further vi. 86. 50; 100. 24, 34; 105. 15 (*pāṇḍavī camūḥ*); vii. 161. 18; 168. 1 (*mahācamūḥ* and *camūḥ* of Kurus); *pṛtanāpati* is the same as *akṣāuhiṇīpati* (viii. 73. 15; vi. 87. 15). Poetical names abound: *dhvajinī*, vii. 92. 5; vi. 54. 91; *ripuvāhinī*, vi. 109. 10, etc. The 'lines' deserve notice, although, as far as I have observed, no use or effect of orderly lines is perceivable in the battle-scenes. The rule that fighting must cease when a priest appears between two lines of battle (*anīkayoḥ*) means of course only the opposing acies (xii. 96. 8); *anīkavelāyām* (where a brave should fight) is 'on the van of the front line' (ib. 97. 18). The real unit of battle-order is not the line, but the group, *çreṇi*, viii. 73. 16. The battle itself is called *saṁkhya, saṁgara, saṁgrāma* (collision, conflict) or simply 'fighting' (*yuddha*, or *yudh*, e. g. i. 19. 14: cf. R. ii. 94. 12, *çakyaḥ soḍhuṁ yudhi*, etc.), but has also its poetical side, and is termed *āhava, ākranda, āmarda*, 'challenging,' 'advance,' 'crush;' or, still

The troops having started with a blare of drums, trumpets, and conch shells, the hosts stream out 'like flamingos crossing a great lake,' each chief making for his particular adversary, against whom he has been pitted by the commander before the fight began.[*] The crowd follows the leaders. Each hero plunges into the fray, scattering the base herd with a commotion 'like that caused by a huge sea fish leaping into the sea,'[†] and is soon at arrow's point with his chosen adversary, or is doubling and twisting about for position, or rushing any whither at need of a friend. His base-born adherents and his high-born following keep close to his heels.[‡] The proceedings at the end of the day (for with sunset the armies generally stop fighting) depend on whether the commander-in-chief has been slain or not. If not, the forces are simply drawn off the field, the men going to bed as soon as they can—sometimes eating and going at once without conversation,[§] although stopping to salute each other, care for their wounds, see to the sentinels, or even, in the case of the knights, taking a bath and listening to some music (*gītavāditra*) while eating before sleeping.[‖] The singers and praisers always welcome them back, however, if merely as a sign of good luck, as they also open the day with their music; since not to have glad music in the morning shows fear, and is a sign of ill-luck.[¶]

But if the commander-in-chief is killed, the officers collect at headquarters, and elect a new commander for the following

---

prettier, *dyūta*, 'gambling,' vi. 59. 39 (93. 42, 'they fought as if in a *svayaṁvara*'!); vii. 85. 27; *raṇe prāṇadyūtapaṇe*, viii. 160. 43. The warrior not only looks on the battle as 'gambling for life,' but goes 'playing' and 'dancing' to his sport (*krīḍann iva nṛtyan*, iii. 280. 64-65; vi. 114. 26, et passim). I do not pretend to have exhausted the vocabulary, but these are the terms chiefly employed.

[*] v. 164. 5; the knights are pitted 'by force and courage' (*yathābalaṁ yathotsāhaṁ rathinaḥ samupādicat, arjunaṁ sūtaputrāya*, etc.)

[†] *praviveça mahāsenām makaraḥ sāgaraṁ yathā*, i. 138. 30; viii. 77. 10: compare ix. 18. 10, *kṣobhayanti sma tāṁ senām makarāḥ sāgaraṁ yathā;* and R. vi. 77. 6, id.

[‡] The Homeric figure of the goose or flamingo is often found, vi. 46. 20; 90. 19 (*utpetuḥ sahasā . . . haṅsā iva mahodadhāu*); 110. 45–45 (*nyamajjaṅs te . . . yathā haṅsāḥ*); but the hero 'stands like an island,' ib. 46. The glance and shimmer of arms makes the army look as if it were 'a wheel of fire' (*alātacakravad balam* vii. 7. 53; 39. 6, etc.: used also of a single bow, vii. 119. 32). Compare *lōhitakardame saṁgrāme*. viii. 27. 40.

[§] 'Then in a twinkling it grew still as heaven, for they did not talk about the fight,' vi. 86. 56 (*na hi yuddhakathāṁ kāṁ cit tatrā 'kurvan*).

[‖] *pūjayantaḥ parasparam . . . rakṣyāṁ kṛtvā çurā nyasya gulmān yathāvidhi*, ib. 53 ff. (bath and *bandin*).

[¶] Thus 'the sound of the bowstring and sacred song' being absent betrays fear in vii. 85. 19. A night conversation is recorded in vi. 80, and a council is held (*mantraṁ cakruḥ*), vi. 97. 2; the chief knight has his own council, although he is neither a king nor commander-in-chief, vii. 75. 31 (*mantrajñāiḥ sacivāiḥ*).

day. At this time also formal vows to slay are given, and conspiracies are formed against any prominent hero on the other side. A detailed description of the election of commander will be found below. The chiefs and common people alike, it may he observed, all appear to sit up and wait for the decision, and hail the new commander—as it is somewhere said, 'thinking no more of their commanders slain, they greeted with great joy their new commander.' That the post of commander-in-chief was much coveted is seen throughout the play, and is emphasized by the fact that Karṇa is so jealous because another is chosen in his stead that he will not fight at all at first, but sits sulking in his tent till his rival is slain and the post of honor then offered to him.*

The time of beginning the fight is not always the same. Sometimes the hosts rise at daybreak and wait for the sun to rise in order to (pray and) begin then the battle; sometimes they do not rise till the sun does.†

The time for closing battle is not always the same. If nothing prevents, the soldiers fight till sundown; but if they are badly beaten, they retire early in the day; and once they light torches, and fight right on into the night.‡

It may be said in advance that guards accompany each knight into the field as escort, and that sentinels watch the tents at night.§

---

* v. 156–168. The commander-in-chief in the Epic is of course a warrior actively engaged in battle. The same title (*senāpati*) given in Ag. P. 220. 1 to an officer to be appointed by the king and designated as of military or of priestly caste must indicate rather a minister of war than a general. Likewise the rules Ag. P. 235. 32–33, that a king must not fight, and that one-third of the force is held as a reserve, are entirely un-Epic.

† vi. 19. 36–9; but 16. 4, *udatiṣṭhat* (*sāinyam*) *sūryodaye*. Getting up as late as the sun was always thought too late (R. ii. 97. 2), if not wrong, as it was proper to greet the sun with prayer.

‡ See below. The absurd scene in vi. 107 (cf. 43. 11 ff.) is too palpably an interpolation to permit its use as usage. Instead of going to bed, the Pāndus march over to the enemy, and interview their dearest foe (who is at the same time their uncle and the leader on the other side) as to the best means of killing him. This inartistic blot is due to the horror felt by the later compilers at the idea of the Pāndus killing their especially holy uncle without his permission (Holtzmann).

§ Individual guards are called *raksin*, a *statio* or squad for guard (*ārakṣa*) is called *rakṣyā* or *gulmaḥ*. Thus, *duryodhano niveçya balaṁ sammānayitvā nṛpatīn nyasya gulmāṅs tathāi 'va ca, ārakṣasya vidhiṁ kṛtvā yodhānām* just before he assembled his council (v. 160. 2). The spies, always part of a camp, and frequently sent across (early in the morning, v. 194. 2), may have made part of the 'protection.' Sometimes an advance squad is meant by *gulma*. Thus *utkṣipta-gulma* is a squad sent on ahead (iii. 15. 11). The tent-guards appear to be of little use (x. 8. 2). Some technicalities may be mentioned here. The word for 'make an attack on one' is generally *apasavyaṁ karoti* (vii. 187. 51, etc.: *anyonyam apasavyaṁ ca kartuṁ vīrāu tad eṣatuḥ*, vii. 188. 27), or

The position of the commander depends on the array. He has not a fixed position, as has been asserted (on Puranic authority). Generally he fights in the van; but he may be more needed rearwards, as in an early battle-account before the great war, where the leader says: 'and I of all the army will stand and guard the rear' (iv. 52. 22 ff.). Or, again, the commander goes ahead, fighting, but is soon left behind by one of the knights.*

The van, rear, flanks, wings, center of the army in the field (*raṇājira*, e. g. xi. 16. 4), all have their proper names. Fore wing and back wing (or flank) are also described.† Worth noting is the fact that the nominal commander-in-chief is displaced by some of his friends, never with contempt, but by his own consent. Thus, it is Yudhishthira who gives to the Pāndus the final order to array at the opening of the war; and he is here, though the leading spirit, not the commander, nor even the chief of the allied forces (v. 154. 17). So Karṇa, though not commander, sends to the Kurus the order to 'harness before sunrise' through the camp by a herald.‡

To return to our orders. Only one distinct quotation seems to be current from the wisdom of antiquity in regard to the best occasions for applying the different *vyūhas* (battle-orders). This rule, that a small force, in order to compete with a large force, should charge in one long narrow column, concentrating all its strength at one point, is applied at the opening of the war, but afterwards only in a hastily made-over array, when another had failed. Of the other battle-orders mentioned, the double triangle with apices joined (*makara*) is employed by the Pāndus once, by the Kurus twice; the wedge (*çakaṭa*) twice by the

---

*samprahāram* (*pracakrire*, vi. 99. 21; *pradharṣaṇa* and *abhipradharṣaṇa*, iii. 243. 3, are personal attacks). 'To withdraw to camp' is regularly *avahāraṁ kurute*, with *sāinyānām* sometimes added (vi. 49. 53; 96. 79; 107. 5, etc.). The subject is the commander-in-chief (vi. 74. 37–39). In this case there was an orderly retreat, although both sides were 'badly broken up' (*te sene bhṛçasaṁvigne yayatuḥ* [sic] *svaniveçanam, tataḥ svaçibiraṁ gatvā nyaviçan; niveçana* is the camp, *çibira* here tent or camp, as in vi. 86. 46 ff.; vii. 17. 1). According to rule, each general protects his own troops in a retreat (vi. 79. 64; 80. 2). The sentinels are set after sunset through the camp (*gulmāḥ paritrastāḥ sūrye cā 'stamite sati*, ix. 29. 64). A distinction is to be observed between the technical *paritrāya* or *trāyasva yoddhān* 'come to the rescue' (vii. 158. 5, ib. 2), and *parivārya* 'defend' or 'attack by surrounding,' 'surround' being the literal meaning of the last (vi. 79. 23; 94. 37; vii. 135. 35).

* ix. 3. 30–36. The commander's title of honor is *agraṇīr nṛṇām*, 'foreleader of men,' sometimes applied to any chief: ix. 61. 37.

† *purato 'pi ca pṛṣṭhe ca pārçvayoç ca*, vi. 90. 37; the flank and fore-flank, *pakṣa* and *prapakṣa*, are common (see below), also called *kakṣa* 'border' (*senākakṣaṁ dadāha samare kakṣam agnir yathā vane*, viii. 55. 28); the same figure is thus applied in R. v. 85. 24.

‡ v. 163. 56–57: *yogaḥ prāg udayāt*.

Kurus (found again later in the fifteenth book), once with a wheel- (*cakra*) addition; the *krāuñca* (*garuḍa* ? rhomboid) is used by Pāndus and Kurus, once as a reserve; the *maṇḍala* (circle) is not only the Kurus' choice, but oddly enough (considering the relative numbers) the Pāndus', though it may be only a 'crescent' here. The difference in forces makes no difference in choice, apparently, except at the outset. It is to be remembered that the Pāndus have only seven 'whole armies' (*akṣāuhiṇīs*); the Kurus, eleven.

A word here on the military authorities. Manu (in spite of his code's military advice) is unknown as a military adviser. That is to say, the seventh book of the Mānava-dharma was expanded to its present form after the battling parts of the Epic were written, as other portions of the Epic show that no slight was intended to this authority. The main sages are Uçanas and Brihaspati. With the latter Manu has many a question of priority to settle.* Another authority (celebrated later) mentioned in the third book, Çālihotra, as 'wise in the knowledge and pedigree of horses,' appears to have confined himself to this specialty, and is not quoted as a guide on broader military affairs. But the rules of the two inseparables, Brihaspati and Uçanas, are quoted often enough to make us certain that a military code must have been composed by them. The one military strategy formally cited (as given above) is from Brihaspati;† and the same author invented the impregnable *vyūha* called *krāuñcāruṇa*.‡ Again, the 'king of battle-orders' is declared to come from the same sage.§ The first of these is probably meant in the Brihaspati-naya of the Rāmāyana.‖ I have already spoken of the rules of Brihaspati and Uçanas,¶ and these occur again as a manual of instruction in the war-part of the Epic.** Their names have become typical of military and philosophical learning.†† But, although Uçanas shares the name and the honor, his friend appears to have been, if we may so speak, the more inventive genius in the science of war: as the citations already given and to be given show. The battle-orders called *çakaṭa*, *padma*, *vajra* are explained in Uçanas' code, according to xv. 7. 15.* The science of the battle-orders was opposed as a special study to all other branches necessary for a warrior to know: 'I am wise in military affairs, and in the battle-orders,' says a chief; 'I can make the mercenaries and those not mercenaries do their duty; in respect of marching, fighting, etc., I know as much as did Brihaspati; I know all the battle-orders of gods and of men,' etc. (v. 165. 8 ff.). The special points of an officer's knowledge seem to be these: how to break through into the foe's advancing battalion, and how to maintain order in his own; as the passage quoted above enjoining double pay for officers able to do this well would indicate. Though we should antecedently assume this as the greatest need in a general (given the Hindu troops and a battle under way), it deserves to be emphasized, from the negative evidence it furnishes that generalship was regarded mainly as fighting-ability confined to the actual conflict; or, in other words, no strategic ability in choosing position, hemming in a foe, preserving free passage to the base of supplies, and other such matters, is lauded. Only knowing how to act when springing at the foe is praised; though universal directions for suiting the ground to the kind of force employed are casually given.

---

* The quotation from the former's *çāstra* in xii. 138. 193–194; 139. 70–74, etc., are not devoted to this topic.

† *saṁhatān yodhayed alpān kāmaṁ vistārayed bahūn, sūcīmukham anīkaṁ syād alpānām bahubhiḥ saha*, 'if you have a small force, make them fight all together; you may extend a large number as you please, but if a few men have to fight with a great many, they ought to present a needle-front' (vi. 19. 4; xii. 100. 47, confirmed by vi. 43. 102: cf. M. vii. 191; Ag. P. 235. 27).

‡ vi. 50. 40; 51. 1.

§ *vyūharāja* in viii. 46. 27 is *bārhaspatya*.

‖ ii. 90. 32; see above, p. 192.

¶ Page 115 (iii. 150. 29).

** *bṛhaspater uçanaso no 'padeçaḥ çrutas tvayā*, 'have you not heard B. and U.'s instruction?' (ix. 61. 48).

†† *naye bṛhaspatyuçanoḥ* (sic), viii. 37. 20: compare iv. 58. 6.

---

* In the account of Rāma's war, compare iii. 285. 6, 7, (*rāvaṇaḥ*) *yuddhaçāstravidhānajña uçanā iva cā 'paraḥ, vyūhya cāu 'çanasaṁ vyūhaṁ harīn abhyavahārayat; rāghavas tu viniryāntaṁ vyūḍhānīkaṁ daçānanam, bārhaspatyaṁ vidhiṁ kṛtvā pratyavyūhan niçācaram.* As to Vālmīki's own account of military arrays, owing to the nature of the war we obtain very little information in regard to the *vyūhas*. The first arrangement appears to have been a mass drawn up in order (R. vi. 16. 2, reading *vyūhya*), and we find the *garuḍa* mentioned before this (ib. 6. 11; *padma* is a cognomen of Rāma, 3. 19); but the war is mainly a siege, and the battle-arrangements amount to nothing. The military proverb preserved in (*phalgu sāinyasya yat kiṁcin madhye vyūhasya tad bhavet*) 'put the weakest force in the middle of the general array' shows us the technical sense of *phalgu* as distinguished from the *sāra* or picked troops, as the term is employed in describing the forces in the Mahābhārata (see below). The technical meaning is of course current. Compare R. vi. 31. 33 (*vyūhena ghoreṇa*); ib. 39. 28, *tvayā devāḥ prativyūḍhāḥ . . yudhi*; ib. 71. 16, *balavyūhena mahatā pālitaḥ*. It may be parenthetically remarked that a number of impossible and inexplicable 'orders' are alluded to in the Epic, under the titles 'mortal,' 'godly,' 'angelic,' and so forth, usually called (e. g. vi. 21. 4) 'impregnable,' and usually without reason (45. 4). They are not used definitely, nor explained, but are current on the lists of possible orders (e. g. v. 57. 11; 165. 10 ff.; vi. 19. 2, 18 ff.); and the officers are expected to know them. They are probably merely the ordinary orders in relation to their origin; thus, the common order called 'thunderbolt' is called 'the unshakable,' and was invented by the Holder of Thunderbolts. This then would be a 'godly' order (vi. 19. 7), *acalaṁ nāma vajrākhyam*, the usual boast: cf. ib. 34, *vajro nāma . . . vyūho nirbhayaḥ sarvatomukhaḥ*; 21. 2, *abhedya*; 4, *akṣobhya* massed against this. The irresistible force was always meeting the immovable body on the Hindu battle-ground.

I pass now to a detailed examination of the devices employed in the actual battles of the great war, the stratagems (in narrow sense) used in the field.

The first battle began in the first hours of the first day after each army had arrived at its respective camping-ground.[*] The Pāndus are encamped in the West; the Kurus, in the East. The battle-field lies near the city of the Kurus, Hāstinapur. The latter stand on the defensive. Each force, with its general soldiers (*yodhāḥ*, *sāinikāḥ*) and officers (*bala-mukhyāḥ*, etymologically equivalent to 'captains,' *mukha* meaning here *caput*), has its grand commander-in-chief (*senāpati or vāhinīpati*),[†] under whom stand the generals that command the different 'whole armies,' or hosts, complete in themselves and so considered, brought by the allies. Such an army within an army was called the *akṣāuhiṇī*, and its general was the *pati* or lord of that division, a term sometimes applied to the commander-in-chief himself. The commander-in-chief was in fact nothing but an 'army-lord' raised to the position of general superintendent, and temporarily exalted over his equals, the 'lords' of each special army. For the special generals were usually simply the kings who had come as allies, and each commanded his own home force, which he had brought with him.[‡] An honorary title of either a king-general or of the commander-in-chief was also *yūthapa*, 'guardian of troops,' indicative of the fact that the army was parcelled into generic troops, the elephants apart from chariots, the foot-soldiers by themselves. This is often the arrangement made; and the more artificial combination, by which each car was surrounded by so many men, and so many cars were distributed to so many elephants, each squad of this sort containing all the fighting elements and making no longer troops in kind, I think a later as a more artificial formation.[§]

---

[*] The whole of the Bhagavadgītā, the absurd scene following, vi. 43. 12–102—in reality, from the end of section twenty to the beginning of the forty-fourth section, where the question asked after the close of the nineteenth section is repeated—all this is an interpolation unnecessary to prove. The position of the forces is given in vi. 20. 5.

[†] Dhrishtadyumna is *saptānāṁ netā senānām pravibhāgavit*, v. 151. 7.

[‡] When we read, therefore, that the Pāndus' commander-in-chief was the 'leader of seven complete armies,' we must take this literally. The Pāndus' force, as a whole, comprised seven distinct armies. But for the sake of convenience we may term those armies in relation to the whole 'army-divisions.'

[§] In regard to the title *yūthapa* compare vii. 193. 49, *rathayūthapayūthapaḥ*; and v. 167. 14, *rathayūthapayūthānāṁ yūthapo 'yam*. The one hundred and sixty-fifth section of the fifth book begins the list of *rathi* (*ratha*), *atiratha*, *mahāratha*, terms applied loosely to denote, not technical distinctions between the generals, but their comparative ability in leading the forces and slaying foes. The terms mean that such a one is either a 'good charioteer,' or a 'superior charioteer,' or a 'surpassingly good charioteer.'

The Pāndus, being the smaller force, wait (in spite of Brihaspati's rule) to see what order will be taken by the Kurus. Those on the defensive are thus obliged to take the initiative. The Kurus' commander-in-chief now masses his troops in heavy bodies. He himself takes his place in the van.* Various chiefs and princes of high rank, ten of whom are especially named (16. 17), aid him; these guard the van of the different battalions, or act as 'wheel-guards' to others. Each greater chief has commonly a pair of these wheel-guards (*cakrarakṣāu*): an indication that the chariot had not four but two wheels in the earlier time. They are often the younger princes, who are thus winning their name of hero by useful service under some renowned knight. They drive in chariots, and are really independent knights, but their strategic position was close to the war-car of the leader whom they were first bound to protect.† The Kuru commander, Bhīshma, was recognizable by his standard, a golden palm-tree,‡ and colored flag, each leader having some such ensign. Bhīshma's general appointments were white, and even his war-car was silvered (vi. 20. 8; 16. 23). Besides the wheel-guard, a special band of fore-fighters (*purogamāḥ*) went in advance with the leader and 'protected' him.§ The king of the Kurus is stationed in the centre, and enters the fight, not in a war-car, but on an enormous white elephant with net-armor. Him guarded thousands of war-cars in front.‖ His maternal uncle, the great villain, Çakuni, was especially charged to look after the king, and accompanied him with hosts of Gāndhāras and mountaineers.¶ The too careful arrangement of the troops spoken of above is given (in a passage that appears late) as follows: one hundred cars support each elephant; one hundred cavalry, each car; ten archers, each horse; one hundred shield-men, each archer.* Such altogether was the Kurus' order of battle. No special name is given to it, but I fancy it was the 'circle.'

---

* *agranīḥ*, vi. 16. 21; 20. 18; *agrataḥ sarvasāinyasya*, ib. 20. 9.

† vi. 19. 17; for position see the whole of this section, and 43. 102; 44. 1 ff.

‡ *hematāla*: cf. vi. 17. 18, *tālena mahatā . . pañcatāreṇa ketunā.*

§ As this term has been occasionally misunderstood, it may be well to point out that in Hindu warfare the protectors drove before the army in general, but behind the protected leader, and were really supporters (vi. 17. 23, seven kings take this part: cf. 18. 10, *pṛṣṭhagopāḥ . . bhīṣmasya putrās tava rarakṣuḥ pitāmaham*). Of course the whole line is 'protected' by the chiefs ahead as well as behind. This is *anīkam pālitam* (vi. 22. 4).

‖ vi. 17. 26, *dhvaja*; 20. 7. In the following, until the end, or unless the book varies, I shall quote by sections only, the book once introduced being understood.

¶ 20. 8. The presence of this man of Kandahar (*gāndhāra*), and his origin in the north-west country, is one of the indications of the Aryans' original locality. Dhritarāshtra, the king of the Kurus, took his wife from the old family country, and her brother lived as a courtier in Hāstinapur, in accordance, perhaps, with that rule which makes it necessary for a king to support all his wife's relations.

Opposed to this the Pāndus, under the direction of Arjuna (for we notice here, as said above, that the king or one he selects is practically commander, while the *sāināpatya* consists less in ordering than in arranging forces), to whom the king, Yudhishthira, has appealed for advice, form in a *prativyūha* or 'counter-array,' by making themselves, on the general principle referred to above, into a 'needle-shaped' modification of the 'thunderbolt' or long column (19. 34, 35). At the head (*agre 'granīḥ*) was Bhīma, 'swift as wind,' and Dhrishtadyumna, the official commander, who, strange to say, is neither chief leader nor director. The king for whom the war was undertaken was behind, or rather 'in the middle' (19. 24), surrounded by elephants; while his younger brothers and his chief ally, Virāṭa, stood just behind the leaders Bhīma and Dhrishtadyumna. Bhīma's special wheel-guards were his younger twin brothers, and his rear-guards were his nephews, to whom in turn Dhrishtadyumna was 'protector;' and there behind this van was Çikhandin, 'protected by Arjuna,' who was the chief knight of this side. Others stood still further back. The right van was guarded by Yuyudhāna. According to the position shown in 22. 3, Dhrishtadyumna was ahead, guarded by Bhīma; and Çikhandin was in the middle, guarded by Arjuna.

It is interesting to note that, as the rule enjoins, a short encouraging speech is really made by the leader to the chiefs before they go their respective stations; wherein they are reminded that death in battle is the door of heaven, and that they are treading the path of warriors, 'the path trod by your forefathers, and by their fathers too' (17. 6 ff.); as well as the fact that the Pāndu king is much discouraged at the sight of the vast array before him, and has to be cheered by his brother, with the words: 'often the few conquer the many; where the right is, there is the victory.'†

When the battle really begins, it is not the real commander, but Bhīma, one of the Pāndus, that leads (44); and at once (45. 8) Bhīshma makes a dart at Arjuna; whereupon the battle becomes, almost immediately, irregular, and shortly fades into a confused fight (*tumula*, tumultus).[*] The first day, after many duels and much 'tumult,' ends resultless at sundown.[†]

---

* See section 20; the anachronism of the 'conspirators' condemns this passage. The *dhānuṣke çataṁ carmiṇaḥ*, 'hundred shield-men to each archer,' is absurd. Mention of 'mortal,' 'divine,' 'angelic,' 'devilish' orders occurs 20. 18. The Puranic literature gives rules for keeping one third of the army as a reserve, but no reserve is kept in the battle as described; all the troops march into the field (except when, as in Karṇa's case, a special personal feeling prevents). See Ag. P. 235. 32.

† *yato dharmas tato jayaḥ*; emended to 'where Vishnu is,' etc.: 21. 11-14.

The second day: At the Pāndus' suggestion, their commander forms his forces into the array of Brihaspati (50. 40) already alluded to, called *krāuṅca* 'great bird'—a battle-order apparently new to the warriors. The Pāndus thus take the initiative, and the Kurus make a counter-array that is not more nearly defined, but described as 'huge.'[‡] The Kurus' leader is in front, but surrounded on all sides, as he leads the great array.[§] In this encounter the Kuru king is stationed in the middle; the Pāndu king, in the rear. The metaphor of the bird-order (*krāuṅca*) is kept up in the details. Thus, the Pāndus' commander with one of the Pāndus make the back-wings (*pakṣāu pṛṣṭhataḥ*); the twin Pāndus are on the left wing; Arjuna's son, with others, on the right wing; while other heroes were on the 'neck,' and still others made the 'eyes';-the king of the Pāndus in the back (*pṛṣṭham*, though 'tail' is often used), surrounded by Nishādas; the father of the commander-in-chief is on the 'head.' The elephants are here disposed, not at all in the artificial order spoken of above, as centerpieces to war-cars, nor yet, as the Greeks describe, as a line in front, but on the tips of the wings.[‖]

Before the Kurus advance, the king makes them an encouraging speech,[¶] exhorting to courage and care of the leader. Then the Kuru commander, with the help of Droṇa and the princes, 'drew up a great (counter-) array,' to which no special name is given; but right and left flank and the king's position in the middle are mentioned (51. 10; 52. 3). The battalions are massed one behind another. Sign that all is ready is given by drum and shell. Again the description becomes one of 'forefighters who led the van,'[**] with a general 'horrible tumultuous battle' as the ranks meet (52. 5); but here Arjuna singles out Bhīshma for a first attack. The second day ends, as before, with no decisive result.

The third day: On this day (56. 1 ff. to 59) Bhīshma leads off with the rhomboid array called the *garuḍa*, a mythological bird whose outstretched wings give the name. Here, too, the metaphor is preserved. The commander is on the beak (*tuṇḍe*); two chiefs on the 'head,' two more make the 'eyes,' others are on the 'neck.' The king is in the rear, surrounded by hosts. The allies are on the 'right wing' and 'left flank'—the metaphor failing, as it often does.* Against this, Arjuna and the commander draw up an array made in the shape of a crescent (*ardhacandra*), on the 'right horn' and 'left flank' of which stand Bhīma and Arjuna, while the commander with other great knights is in the center, as is the Pāndus' king. The day ends undecided. Each commander fights in front, as we are told (57. 31). The counter-array is quite interesting. It will be seen that, as the Kurus' *garuḍa* advanced, the van, being the apex of a triangle, was met by a semicircular enclosing host (crescent) on the part of the Pāndus, so that the Kurus' leader, standing on the apex, met the Pāndus' leader, standing half-way between the two horns of his own army. But the attempt of the seven-armied Pāndus to enclose the eleven-armied Kurus seems ludicrous.

---

[*] Bhīshma, considering their relative position, must have flung everything into confusion by his direct onslaught upon Arjuna. Çikhandin has suddenly disappeared.

[†] *prāpte cā 'staṁ dinakare, avahāram akurvanta*, 49. 52-53.

[‡] 50-55: the *krāuṅcāruṇanāma*, or simply *krāuṅca* (51. 1), was unseen before this (*adŗşţapūrva*, 50. 41). The Kurus' array is simply *mahāvyūha* (51. 10).

[§] *prakarşan mahatīṁ vāhinīm*, 51. 11.

[‖] *pakşakoţiprapakşeşu pakşānteşu ca vāraṇāḥ, jagmuḥ parivŗtāḥ* (50. 55).

[¶] *prāhe 'daṁ vacanaṁ kāle harşayaṅs tanayas tava*, 51. 4.

[**] *praharatāṁ çreşţhāḥ samprahāram pracakrire*, 52. 1 ff.

The fourth day: No especial description enlivens the dreariness of the irregular combats. 'An array like a cloud' and 'an array unseen before' (60. 7, 11) explain themselves but vaguely. Sections sixty to sixty-nine, embracing this day, are largely interpolated (65–68) with religious passages.

The fifth day: After the Vishnu interruption, the array of the fifth day is described (69. 2 ff.). Bhīshma now employs the exact reverse of that used on the third day, namely the *makara*, or array consisting of two triangles, with apices making the centre; bases, rear and van. The Pāndus 'made their own array' against this; each side drew out all its forces, chariots, foot, elephants, and cavalry. Beholding the great double-triangle-array of the Kurus, the Pāndus brought against it the *çyena* or 'hawk,' another bird-order, 'a very king of battle-orders:' on the front of which stood Bhīma; the eyes of which were the commander and Çikhandin; on the neck Arjuna, etc. The king is again in the rear, and various allies on the wings. Bhīma makes the first onslaught, plunging into the *makara*. Again on the part of the Pāndus we find a clever attempt to pierce the broad oncoming van of the foe, as they had before tried to enclose the sharp van. Arjuna's position on the neck enables him to rush at once to the rescue of Bhīma, whose onslaught upon Bhīshma is sudden and direct, showing that the 'hawk' order was intended to facilitate a sharp attack at the centre of the foe. The king of the Kurus urges Droṇa on, and appears to be near the front soon after the battle begins. All details are passed over. The contest ends undecided. This fifth day ends with section seventy-four.

---

* *dakṣiṇam pakṣam āsādya vāmam; pārçvam avasthitāḥ*, 56. 8–9.

The sixth day: The Pāndus now imitate the array of their foes chosen on the preceding day, after they have all 'drawn out again for battle as soon as night had passed' (75. 1 ff.). The commander is again told by the Pāndu king what to lead out, the latter recommending the *makara*, which is got ready just before sunrise.* Drupada and Arjuna are near the van of this array; the latter's younger brothers stand beside him; Bhīma is again the 'mouth,' and, passing over others, the commander and Virāṭa, the chief ally, are here found in the rear. 'Two guards of the battle-array' form the right flank, and five other allies occupy the left. Two others are on the feet, and Arjuna's son with Çikhandin are on the tail (*pucche*). The *makara* is, therefore, here imagined to be weakest at the middle flank, which has special guards. Noticeable is the especial valor of Bhīma, who incites his commander to follow him (77. 32). The Kurus, to meet this, their own array, come out in the *krāuṅca* (already adopted by the Pāndus on the second day, and not needing here another description, but that the Kuru king is on the neck, while in the corresponding position of the second day the Pāndu king was stationed in the rear). In the further description we have a mixture of technical terms, whereby appears that this *makara* was of a 'thunderbolt' pattern: that is, probably, that it was as solid a body as the phalanx.† It is stated here that the soldiers all fought with their like (in accordance with the formal law): that is, each horseman fought a horseman, each footman a footman. This law practically held good, however, neither for the lowly nor for the exalted. Every knight kills footmen; every footman attacks knights. A very interesting making-over of the array diversifies this day. At noon, when, as usual, everything is in confusion, a portion of the Pāndus make themselves up into an entirely new array, with reversion to their first principles; and, forming a 'needle,' they charge the heavy phalanx of the foe, successfully break it, and rescue their imperiled leaders, who have allowed themselves to become caught in the enemies' centre (77. 59). The sixth day ends with the seventy-ninth section.

---

* The commander has his orders from Yudhishthira again in 87. 16, when told to get up a *prativyūha*. In fact, though 'commander' is better than 'leader' as a translation of *pati* here, this generalissimo is constantly commanded by more experienced knights and kings. The king tells what to do; the 'commander,' how to do it. Thus the commander 'directs the knights' (*vyādideça rathinaḥ*, 75. 5) how to form, and this appears to have been his chief business.

† *vyūhaṁ tam makaraṁ vajrakalpam praviçya*: compare the regular 'thunderbolt' on the seventh day.

The seventh day: Bhīshma, still commander, 'skilled in battle-orders' (*vyūhaviçārada*), draws out now a complete circle, filled with fighters, elephants, foot-soldiers and chariots.* This array is 'very hard to break,' being bordered by war-cars, spear-men, and knife-men. The king is here on a chariot, as he usually is; the first day's elephant-riding for a king appears anomalous and late. Against this the king of the Pāndus brings the 'thunderbolt,' not further described (*vajram akarot*, 81. 21, 23). The attack of the thunderbolt succeeds. The fight again becomes almost that instant a mêlée. Droṇa's son attacks Çikhandin, and 'all the chiefs' attack Arjuna (25 and 27). Here also ten horses are said to accompany one elephant; ten archers, one horse; a hundred shield-men, one archer (81. 14). The day ends with the eighty-sixth section. One must again admit the correctness (I speak as one unlearned) of the tactics said to be used by the Pāndus. Against an advancing force formed in a circle bordered with war-cars and spear-men (it will be observed that here the elephants are not on the flank) they placed a solid phalanx deep enough to break the line (of equal strength throughout) opposed to them, and yet broad enough to maintain their ground without danger of being surrounded when once an entrance had been effected.†

The eighth day: Again a new array appears, but without enlightening name. The Kurus (87. 1–13) make an array 'like the sea.'‡ At the head of this huge body stands the commander, surrounded as usual; the king with his brothers far behind. On the Pāndu side, their king directs the commander to make a counter-array, but does not suggest the form. The latter disposes the troops in an entirely new order—I am doubtful whether to call it a triangle or a square. Its name is *çṛṅgāṭaka* 'the horned array'; of the horns, the two mentioned are filled by Bhīma and Sātyaki, with their 'several thousand war-cars, steeds, and foot.' Arjuna's position is between them; the king also occupies the middle position, while brave warriors who know the statutes on arrays fill the battle-order.§ Others are in the rear. From the commentator this would seem to be an array in the shape of a Greek cross (*catuṣpathā-*

---

* The circle complete is called *maṇḍala*, distinguished from the half-moon above described, but not from the synonyms of *maṇḍala*, viz. *padma* or *padmaka* (lily), *cakra* (wheel).

† My temporary contemplation of these battle-arrays as if historical formations, instead of poetic fancies, is of course a mere matter of convenience. The much-added-to and long elaborated descriptions of the war-scenes are betrayers of their own non-primitive character: underlying which we have, however, certain ancient battle-orders preserved, and many κλέα ἀνδρῶν from an earlier period.

‡ *sāgaropama* or *sāgarapratima*, ib. 5 and 13.

§ *vyūhaçāstraviçāradāḥ*, 87. 19, 20.

*kāra*), but the description would more imply a triangle-array with the base as van. Immediate confusion prevents further analysis of this order. The eighth day ends with the ninety-sixth section.

The ninth and tenth days: These present no technical names, but the ordering of the array is instructive. After a conversation and dispute between the Kuru king and commander (97), the former describes to his brother the Pāndu array. Two heroes form a left and right wheel-guard as protectors of Arjuna; he in turn is the protector of Çikhandin.* The king now bids his brother see to it that Çikhandin shall not kill Bhīshma. Accordingly the prince puts Bhīshma before him, and so advances (*bhīṣmam pramukhataḥ kṛtvā prayayāu*, 50); on which Arjuna calls out 'put Çikhandin before Bhīshma, and I will be his protector' (*goptā*, 51). The Kuru commander had refused to kill Çikhandin. This being arranged, the array is completed on the Kurus' side, and met by one on the part of the Pāndus. The position of different forces is given, but no name of the arrays is mentioned. The Kuru king is in the centre, the Pāndu in the van, of his array (99.1–10). With section one hundred and seven this day ends; and on the tenth day (108. 3 ff.), after the extraordinary interpolation of the night visit to Bhīshma, the Pāndus put Çikhandin ahead and make the battle-order. Bhīma and Arjuna are his wheel-guards. The commander is here in the rear, but not so far back as the king of the Pāndus and Virāṭa. The Kurus, anxious to protect Bhīshma, after putting him in front, follow him close. He appoints the infernal battle orders,† not explanatory through their names. Arjuna is as usual the fore fighter, except that he guards the wheel of Çikhandin.‡ Arjuna has to encourage Çikhandin by shouting 'do not fear, I will kill Bhīshma' (110. 2). The Kurus all attack Arjuna as he seeks to kill Bhīshma: 'He was wounded often, but was not afraid,' it is said; and again: 'Arjuna alone, warding off many, routs the Kurus.' It is he who 'makes the king of the Kurus fly and crushes his army' (111. 56).

The end of the tenth day closes the sixth book. The first decided victory is gained by the Pāndus. The Kuru commander is slain. This evening, therefore, the Kuru king selects a new commander in the person of Droṇa, the old teacher of both the families (but pledged to support the Kurus, and the natural foe of the Pāndus' allies).

---

* The last is *rakṣyamāṇa*; Arjuna is *goptar*: 98. 47–48.

† *Bhīṣmaḥ . . āsurān akarod vyūhān pāiçācān atha rākṣasān*, 16.

‡ Compare *arjunapramukhāḥ pārthāḥ puraskṛtya çikhaṇḍinam bhīṣmaṁ yuddhe 'bhyavartanta*, 18.

The eleventh day: This is the first day of Droṇa's generalship, and begins with the seventh book—which, as the elder Holtzmann said, is replete with repetitions and additions. The new commander usually discards the arrays used by his predecessor, and shows considerable skill in combining different orders. The Pāndus, however, from now on strike out nothing new, but either use old forms or imitate those of Drona. The latter's novelties are the wedge, and a combination of the wedge and wheel. Besides these he uses the rhomboid, under the technical name of *suparṇa* (for *garuḍa*), and the circle, here called *cakra* (wheel).[*] On the first day no new details of warfare appear. Droṇa makes the wedge array, and it is met by the *krāuñca*, 'bird-array,' already described. This day ends with the sixteenth section of the seventh book.

The twelfth day (conspirators' day): The warfare of this day is diversified by the conspirators (who have sworn to kill Arjuna) making their own 'battle-order' in the shape of the moon, and advancing with this 'array' of a comparatively small number of men.[†] In like manner, after Droṇa has suddenly advanced 'drawn up in full array' (*vyūḍhānīka*), the Pāndus as suddenly (20. 4) make up a counter-array in the shape of a semi-circle (*maṇḍalārdha*), probably the same as the 'crescent' that they used (to meet a similar attack) on the third day. The Kuru king is in the van with his brothers. Droṇa's order, so suddenly brought against the Pāndus, is incidentally mentioned under the name of the 'bird' (*suparṇa*), employed by Bhīshma long before. This scene is probably an imitation of the earlier one, as the seventh book as a whole is later. We are told that a whole *akṣāuhiṇī* guarded the right flank (9). It is rather remarkable to find the important position of the 'neck' taken by Çakas, Yavanas, and Kāmbojas. The whole day is rather tumultuous (*tumula, sukalila*, 32. 75), though an attempt at order is pretended. This day ends with the thirty-second section.

The thirteenth day: Another 'circle'-array is formed, noted as especially hard to penetrate.[‡] The king here is in the middle, the commander in the van (*pramukhe* or *agre*). The 'followers' (*anugāḥ*, socii) as usual attend the princes. The Pāndus have no mentioned form. They seem especially to dread the circle.[§] The princes royal guard the king's chariot-wheels on the Kuru side, and make much ado about it.[‖] The day ends with the eighty-third section.

---

[*] The *cakravyūha* is prophesied for the war: e. g. i. 67. 118.

[†] *vyūhyā 'nīkaṁ candrākāram*, 18. 1: compare 7.

[‡] *durbhida, abhedya; cakravyūha:* vii. 33. 14, 19; 34. 13.

[§] Compare the hurried colloquy of the chiefs before Abhimanyu's death, and Arjuna's remark in 72. 20.

[‖] *arāsthāneṣu vinyastāḥ kumārāḥ*, 34. 14.

The fourteenth day: This begins with the eighty-seventh section. The night has been spent in grief on the part of the Pāndus, the son of Arjuna having been basely killed, for which Arjuna swears revenge. This day alone continues into the night. Torches take the place of the sun. The battle-array is indicated in advance. It shall be composed of a 'wedge and circle':[*] that is, as the following explanation shows, the wedge forms the front, the circle the rear, of the whole combination. The object of this array is twofold: first, to form an offensive front; and secondly, to make a posterior order impenetrable enough to restore to courage the frightened Jayadratha (whom Arjuna has sworn to slay), and enable him to go into the fight. The two portions are described in double metaphors: the 'wagon' and 'needle' on the one hand, the 'wheel' and 'lily' on the other. It is the most ponderous and unwieldy of all the arrays described, and is represented in our account as follows (87. 20 ff.). After the troops, with a by-play of skilful manoeuvres with sword and bow,[†] have advanced, some of the royal princes station themselves, with half-a-thousand elephants bearing soldiers, at the head of the army, standing in the extreme van (*agrānīke*, 21), to protect Jayadratha. The array was invented and personally arranged by Droṇa. It has two parts: the first consists of a force twelve *gavyūtis* in depth, and at the back of this stands a 'hinder part,' five *gavyūtis* long.[‡] The array includes the common infantry, the chariots, the elephants, and the cavalry. The officers were arranged 'here and there' (23). 'Now,' it is said, 'in the back of this (whole combination) was a lily, an embryo-array, very hard to pierce; and, again, there was made a concealed array stationed in the middle of this lily-with-a-needle-array.' That is, the lily, or circular array at the back of the wedge, was an enclosure for another needle-shaped array. At the head of this 'needle' were stationed Kritavarman; next came two allies with their forces; next to these, Duryodhana and Karṇa; then, a hundred thousand soldiers stationed in the 'wedge' and guarding the front (that is, the fore-part in general). Back of all these, on the flank of the needle and right in the middle of the rear of the lily (cf. 75. 27), stood Jayadratha. But on the van of the whole 'wedge' (the general array enclosing the 'lily' and 'needle') stood the commander, Droṇa.[§] There are then three arrays: an all-including wedge-shaped order (at the head of which stood Droṇa); a circular array in the back part of this wedge, extending five-twelfths of the distance from the rear to the van of the wedge; a secret hidden array (inside the circular array) shaped like a needle, the flank of which was in the rear-centre of this circular array; and here the man to be defended stood.

---

[*] *çakaṭaḥ padmakaç cā 'rdho vyūhaḥ*, vii. 75. 27.

[†] *carantas tv asimārgāṅç ca dhanurmārgāṅç ca çikṣayā*. 5.

[‡] Compare with this (22) the statement in 14 that the warriors surrounded Droṇa *gavyūtiṣu trimātrāsu*.

[§] *sūcīpadma* must be interpreted 'lily enclosing a needle,' as in 22 *cakraçakaṭa* means the wedge enclosing the lily (wagon and wheel): otherwise we should have Jayadratha on the flank of the outer array: whereas the whole arrangement is made in order to hide him in as deep a mass as possible.

To oppose this array, the Pāndus formed another, but of what sort we are not told, the numbers only being indicated.

Interesting as is the array, more interesting is the scene in the latter part of the day. So undecided is the conflict that when, with the setting of the sun, darkness comes, the troops are ordered still to fight on, and later still commanded to pause only to supply themselves with lights. The army is withdrawn, a new array is made. It is like the arrays made by the gods and demons.* It is now near midnight (*niçīthe bhāirave sati*, 165. 20; 168. 26), when the king, seeing all order gone, reforms the army, and after doing so cries 'cast aside your weapons, seize the glowing torches.' This they do. Five lanterns (*vidīpaka*) are fastened on every war-car, three torches (*pradīpaka*) are attached to every elephant, and one to every horse. Thus the Kurus.

The Pāndus placed seven torches on each elephant and ten on each car (163. 16, 17, 28), and two on the back of each horse, before and behind, while others were hung upon the standards of the war-cars. The infantry carried oil-lamps (*pāvakatāila-hastāḥ*, 18; *jvalitāgnihastāḥ*, 29). It was light as day.

The order of fighting is as confused as ever. Yudhishthira appears in advance with Çikhandin behind him (183); Droṇa divides the army into two parts; and the Pāndus' aim is to 'split the front ranks'† by forcing Arjuna to the front (*āji-çīrṣa*) to 'burn his foes.' The ease with which he breaks the great array and kills Jayadratha is not less than that with which most of the arrays are disposed of. No matter how large or skilfully planned, they were nothing but masses ready to flee, headed by a few knights. And Arjuna happened to be the best knight.

This long contest weakens the Kurus. Arjuna has his revenge; the Kurus' leader Drona is also slain (184 to 193), while the Pāndus' commander and the best knights are still alive. Worthy of notice is the fact that on the morning of this second day the soldiers stop fighting at sunrise to offer the orison (186. 1–4). Nothing of immediate interest breaks the monotony of tedious recital, except still more tedious inter polated tracts; and the fight drags slowly to the end of the seventh book, completing here at last the fourth and fifth days of Droṇa's commandership, the fourteenth and fifteenth of the whole war.

---

* Apparently referring to the light: cf. *ulkāçata*, 164. 5; the description is from 163. 10 ff.

† *bhindhy anīkam, apasavyam imān kuru*, 186. 11, 18.

Droṇa, although as strong as if he were but sixteen, was eighty-five years of age (193. 43), and a younger man is now chosen commander to take his place. No better description of this ceremony occurs than the scene at the opening of the eighth book. The Kurus hold a consultation after the Pāndus are in battle-order (10. 1 ff.) The regular ministers of civil affairs are present at the council, but scarcely share in it, as all is done by the knights. The prince makes a speech, and expounds the need of the hour. Açvatthāman follows, and proposes Karṇa as the new commander. The prince compliments Karṇa, and says: 'I know thy valor and thy love for me; be thou our commander.'* The king continues (to encourage this youngest of commanders): 'Our former commanders, Bhīshma and Droṇa, were old and weaker men and were (therefore) slain; Bhīshma being dead and Droṇa being dead, Karṇa shall conquer the Pāndus' (24, 25, 38). Karṇa replies: 'I have said that I would slay the Pāndus. I will be thy commander.' Then the formal consecration is performed. Water is poured upon the knight, and this act is regarded as a religious ceremony.† The vessels used, of earth and gold, have been previously made holy. The exercises are such as accompany a coronation. The seat is of *udumbara* wood, the cover is linen, the performance 'is according to the rule of the *çāstra*,' and 'with one mind the priests, the knights, the men of the people-caste, and the slaves rejoiced over the consecrated knight' (47). The priests that aided the ceremony are then fed, and they unite with the regular 'praisers' in extolling the new commander.

We might pause here to ask whether this was not originally a coronation service: whether the similarity between the election to generalship and that to kingship does not lie in the fact that they were at first identical; whether, as royal power grew to be different from battle-power, the king did not find it necessary to choose a (practical) chief, another king, of the fighting class, incapable himself of directing the soldiers' power on the field; whether, therefore, this ceremony is not simply a survival; whether the mention of all the castes rejoicing does not indicate a former assembly of the people at large. But beyond the suggestion there is nothing. No proof of this except that, in combination with the electoral legends spoken of in a former paragraph, there exists no *à priori* reason for rejecting what appears at once as the simplest explanation of the historical significance of this election to generalship.*

---

* It is interesting to note here the *tutoyer* of 10.22 followed by the formal 'Sir' in 24, 32, and then again by 'thou' in 34. Elsewhere, in choosing a commander, the king says 'Sir' until the ceremony is over. and then drops again into the usual 'thou': see below.

† *abhiṣiṣicuḥ karṇaṁ vidhidṛṣṭena karmaṇā*, 43.

The sixteenth day (viii. 11. 13 ff.): With the noise of horns and the usual musical accompaniment of forming the order of the day, the new commander draws out the double array, consisting of two triangles, of which the apices form the centre, and the bases make the van and rear, respectively (*makara*). This has already been employed by the Kurus on the fifth, and by the Pāndus on the sixth day. The commander stands on the 'snout' of the sea-beast with which this array is compared. The Hawk and the Owl (two great chiefs) are the 'eyes'; Droṇa's son is on the 'head,' with the 'neck' full of followers. The left foot (*vāmapāda*) holds Kritavarman; the right, Gautama; Çalya stands on the left rear ('after-foot,' *anupāde yo vāmaḥ*, 19); Duḥçāsana, on the right rear; the two brothers Citra and Citrasena keep the 'tail' (*puccha*). Then it is the Pāndus' part to arm against this array. 'Now looked the king on Arjuna, and said: "It is a vast array; draw out against this mighty host whatever form you will."' Then Arjuna guarded against this array by means of a half-moon array (*ardhacandreṇa*), on the left flank of which he stationed Bhīma, on the right Dhrishtadyumna, while he himself stood in the middle with the king, back of whom were stationed the twin brothers. Now Arjuna's wheel-guard were the two Pancālas, 'who, being protected by him, did not desert him in the fight.'† All the other knights were placed as before the opening of the first day's battle, according to their ability or zeal.‡ That is to say, in arranging the knights, the force brought with each ally had to be regarded in reference to its efficiency as a counterpoise against any one body standing on the other side. What these bodies were could easily be made out by the ensigns and decorations. 'Then beat the drums, then rolled the cars, and the armies danced toward each other, wing by wing, forewing by forewing; glorious was the sight of the army, like unto the full moon in its glory.' But on their meeting follows as ever confusion, amid the 'clash of arms of every kind' (12. 1–10). With the thirtieth section ends the sixteenth day, the first of Karna's generalship.

---

* I have already noted the fact that the commander must not only be a hero, *çūra*, but 'of good family': *kulīnaḥ*, ii. 5. 46; so R. ii. 109. 40; and in R. ii. 109. 28 'a hero and *saṁgrāmanītijña*.'

† *nā 'rjunaṁ jahatur yuddhe pālyamānāu kirīṭinā*, 31: an unusual use for 'protected.'

‡ *yathābhāgaṁ yathotsāhaṁ yathāyatnaṁ ca*, 32: compare vi. 1. 30.

The seventeenth day: But Karṇa is unsuccessful. With the coming of another evening has come no advance against misfortune. Another tent-council is held. The relations between king, ally, and knight are nowhere better shown than in this scene. We must remember that Karṇa was the best knight in the Kurus' estimation, and that he was a prime favorite of the king. With the close of Karṇa's first day 'they make a council' (31. 7, *mantram mantrayanti*), to see what can be done in order to render Karna's lack of success less for the following day; for they are 'like snakes reft of poison and crushed under foot.' It is the wish of the king that his ally Çalya, a famous charioteer, should serve Karṇa in this capacity on the morrow. Çalya, who subsequently becomes commander, is evidently anxious to get the latter position, and is angered at the proposal that he should serve Karṇa. Karṇa himself, furious at his want of success after so much boasting, stands in the tent 'pressing hand on hand, and raging like a snake.' The king breaks his proposal to Çalya: 'We will go behind you, O Çalya; do thou be charioteer to Karṇa and save the Kurus.'* But Çalya, although being addressed with deference, grows so angry that his brow is wrinkled into a triangle,† being 'mad with pride of his family and his kingship, his learning and his forces;' and he says: 'Much thou insultest, and suspectest much, thou son of the Gandhārī, when thou sayest to me so confidently 'let him be a charioteer,' and thinkest Karna is a better than we. I do not play escort to my equal; point out anyone here superior to me, and I will conquer him in conflict; then I will go whence I have come; or I will fight alone. Look at my prowess in war; insult me not; see my thick arms; behold my bows and arrows, my car and club; I am one fit to destroy my foes; why then employ me in the base work of being a charioteer to this low-born knight, this Karṇa?‡ It is a great shame when one puts a better man under the control of a worser—a better man, who has come to him and stands under his power for love.' Çalya's speech is too long to quote in full, but this extract shows its tone. He is especially insulted because Karṇa himself is nothing but the son of a charioteer (as the world supposes), 'for there are caste-differences; the priests come from the mouth of God, the warriors from his arms, the people from his thighs, the slaves from his feet; the warriors are protectors, restrainers, givers, etc., the slaves are servants of all, and a charioteer is servant to priests and warriors. Shall I then, a consecrated king, born of a royal-seer family, called a great knight, honored and praised of praisers—shall I be charioteer to a charioteer's son! Thou hast insulted me; I will not fight; I will go back to my own country.'* The king, however, appeases Karṇa gradually, by 'speaking in a soft voice,' and complimenting Çalya highly; adding that he does not wish Çalya to 'hold the horses,' but to impress the foe by his presence; concluding with the tale of the god's grandfather, who once served as charioteer to the gods. Çalya is at length mollified, and apologizes to the king and Karṇa;† using as he does so the respectful 'Sir' to the king, and quoting the familiar proverb 'Self-blame, self-praise, blame of another, praise of another—these are four acts not practiced by the Aryans' (45). But the quarrel is not ended. Karṇa begins to boast again, and Çalya remarks that Karṇa always boasts till he hears his enemy's horn. Karṇa retorts by a curse, calls Çalya a miserable fool who knows nothing about fighting, and vituperates his country as well, expatiating at length on all the vices of Çalya's countrymen and countrywomen,‡ till the king stops the strife; and without further ado they go amicably to battle, Çalya claiming, however, the right of standing with the commander.§

---

* 32. 28, *paritrātu*; in the first verse the king is represented as 'humbly and respectfully addressing' his ally (*vinayeno 'pasaṁgamya . . . abravīt*).

† *triçikhām bhrūkuṭiṁ kṛtvā*, 30.

‡ *sārathye nīcasyā 'dhiratheḥ* (*karṇasya*): 'base work,' *adhuri niyoktum* (41): 'anyone' above, literally 'any party' (*añça*); the king addresses Çalya with 'thou' and 'Sir' (28–29); Çalya uses 'thou.'

The new array of Karṇa and Çalya is called 'the king of arrays;' but though the relative position of the forces is given, nothing very definite can be gleaned from the description. It is to be noted that, as before, the commander is set aside by the king of the Pāndus, who tells Arjuna (46. 31) to draw up any array (*nītir vidhīyatām*) which seems best to oppose to that of the Kurus, which, in turn, is merely called *bārhaspatya* (27), leaving us in doubt which of Brihaspati's inventions is intended. No descriptive name of the Pāndus' array is supplied (47. 4). The end of the eighth book, or really the seventh section of the ninth, closes this day, wherein the execution of Bhīma's ancient vow to drink Duḥçāsana's heart's blood is described (viii. 83. 36); but, except for this and a sudden party interest in the passive gods (87. 42 ff., 48), no scene of particular consequence occurs till we reach the end. Here it is pretended that Arjuna, at first unwilling to kill Karṇa 'unlawfully' (90. 70), is persuaded to do so by divine influence. Karṇa dies (91. 55), and his quondam charioteer is elected commander for the next day.

---

* It is odd that 'restrainer' (*saṁgrahītar*) in 45 is a term actually used at times to designate a charioteer.

† *yat tu karṇam aham brūyām . . mama tat kṣamatāṁ sarvaṁ bhavān karṇaç ca sarvaçaḥ*, 35. 43.

‡ 40. 15–16, 17 ff.: compare 44. 5–7 on Vāhīkas, and again 45. 19 ff., where the Pāñcanadadharma gives an insight into the recognition of Aryan and un-Aryan law in the Punjab, and marks the time of the scene.

§ A long interpolation occurs in 45. The knight is approached as by a suppliant so long as the king desires his consent and help. When all is arranged, and the promise given, the king is king again. Compare ix. 6. 17 ff. The chiefs surround him whom they desire to be commander. They give him 'words of victory.' The king stands on the ground, and the chief, who is here reluctant to assume the dangerous part, stands proudly in his chariot. The king even supplicates (*prāñjali*), 'Let the gentleman be our hero, let him be our leader at the head of the army.' The chief replies, 'What thou wilt I will do,' with the same interchange of person noticed above; for when the king has obtained consent he consecrates the knight, saying, 'Thee I elect to the commandership; protect thou us, destroy our foes' (*sāināpatyena varaye tvām . . so 'smān pāhī jahi çatrūn*). The chief's answer is here formal: 'I will fight the Pāndus at the head of thy army. I will be thy leader of armies; I will arrange a battle-array through which the foes shall not break,' literally 'cross' (*na tariṣyanti yam pare*, ix. 7. 5). *senāpraṇetar* is here the title preferred, but the titles *vāhinīpati, camūpati, senāpati, akṣāuhinīpati, dhvajinīpati* (vi. 54. 91: cf. Kām. Nīt. xviii. 43), though not equally common, are all synonymous.

The eighteenth and last day (ix. 8. 24 ff.): Çalya stands in front in the 'mouth' of the new array. On his left is Kritavarman and the Trigartas; on the right, Gautama, surrounded by Çakas and Yavanas, behind whom stands Droṇa's son with the Kāmbojas. The king occupies the centre, guarded by Kurus. No array of Kurus or Pāndus is mentioned by name, though it is significant that the Kuru king is again in the centre, while the Pāndu king, with his line (*anīka*) of men, advances right forward against the commander on the opposite side. The Pāndus are here at the outset divided into three general divisions, which, however, soon become commingled.

The fight is at last over. The Kurus are utterly routed. The Kuru king, wounded, is found at night by his own chiefs, and, ignorant of the uselessness of the act, consecrates another chief before he dies, bidding water be fetched in a cup (*kalaço jalapūrnaḥ*), which he pours on the head of his chosen chief.

But the Pāndus meet no more arrays. They are surprised at night and overthrown and their commander is slain.*

4. *Observations on the Usages in the Field.*—I turn now to a consideration of the general practices in war, based upon the details given above.

The Hindu camp is a miniature town, as we saw at the beginning of the second division of this paper. Each army in the war described in the Epic had time to construct a camp before fighting, and in it we find, besides the military, not only minstrels and women of low order, but also women of birth.

---

* Book ten. The scene in ix. 65. 37 ff. is the last appointment of a commander.

The camp being near the town, women and old men visit and wander through it at all times, even watching the fighting. Drāupadī, Vairāṭī, and Subhadrā are, for instance, all in camp, and bewail the death of Abhimanyu. The old men that linger in the camp form an escort for the women at the close of the war, and escort them back to town in wagons drawn by asses.*

The four castes are in camp, and (perhaps with the priests) implied in battle, where (as quoted above, p. 185) a priest is challenged, and where it is said that glory and heaven are the reward of him that dies in battle, whether he be a warrior, a man of the people-caste, or a slave. This subject has, however, been discussed above, with the inference to be drawn from the character of Droṇa and his son, and the application of the 'blood-for-blood' rule.†

The arrangement of the forces in the field may be compared with the forty-six peoples brought into battle by Xerxes. The allies, as in Roman warfare, are generally the wings, *alæ*, but we find them often in van or centre. Each allied host is a complete army in itself, and the tie connecting the different divisions is very weak, being visible only in the opening of the battle, where the nominal order of the commander-in-chief still obtains. I have already casually observed that the station of the commander depends entirely on the exigencies of the moment. He has no regular position; but his title with his acts would persuade us that his regular place was in the van.‡

On the Kuru side in the war, the first commanders are venerable in themselves as well as *ex officio*. The venerable uncle and teacher do not need their new rank to ennoble them. Thus one of them says to the king (his family inferior), 'go back, save thyself,' and goes himself to the front (vi. 95. 11); neither such command nor obedience in this regard being paralleled by Pāndu action, where the commander lacked the native authority. But though the commander does not often interfere with the king's personal movements, to watch and preserve him is one of his chief duties, and *rakṣa rājānam* are words always on his lips. For this purpose he orders individual knights over the field, and sends them hither and thither.* The king does not hesitate to revile the commander, nor does the commander shrink from telling the king that he is a fool. The two stand on a footing of friendly intimacy.†

---

* Compare the camp, v. 152. 8; ii. 23. 21 ff.; vi. 121. 4; vii. 85. 12; wailing of the women, vii. 78. 36 (compare ib. 127. 24); old men and escort, ix. 29. 65, 73; vi. 19. 22.

† The words in viii. 47. 18–19 are: *teṣām antakaraṁ yuddham . . , kṣatraviṭçūdravīrāṇāṁ dharmyaṁ svargyaṁ yaçaskaram.* In v. 179. 25, 'raising a weapon' lowers a priest to the warrior-caste; but Droṇa, whether truly or not, is thought of only as of priestly-caste: *avidhyad brāhmaṇaṁ saṁkhye*, vii. 117. 26 (compare viii. 15. 29; 55. 33–35: *kṣatriyeṇa dhanur nāmyaṁ sa bhavān brāhmaṇabruvaḥ*, above, p. 38).

‡ This is the earlier position, so to speak; for at first the commander was the active general. Thus he is *netā, praṇetā*, i. e. *prætor* in its first sense (compare ix. 6. 17; 7. 4, etc.); and the words addressed to him are *prayātu no bhavān agre . . anuyāsyāmahe tvā*, vii. 6. 9. Subsequently, success in battle depended on policy as much as on individual fighting; with civilization came more strategy. To this later period we must refer the commander as minister and diplomat. In the well-known story of v. 156. 4 ff., the priests fought with the warriors, but were defeated every time, though aided by the people-caste and the slaves. At last they hit on the device of getting a commander-in-chief. Thereby they defeated the warriors. This is not strength, but brains.

The commanders of the two forces sometimes come out before the hosts and battle in single combat 'for all the world to see.' Neither is guarded, for individual knights 'guard others (the king, etc.), but are not themselves guarded.'‡

Of the forces employed, besides national divisions, we must make others that are not generally specified. The *caturvidham balam* is an *agmen quadratum:* that is, an array perfect in all its parts, of which four are most prominent. These we must again divide, for the first part of the quadrate is the elephant force, and these animals are either driven individually (ridden by a prince, for example) or by many low-fighters; the second part is the cavalry, and these accompany war-cars, or make a solid squadron; the third part, designated as knights in chariots, is to be similarly divided; and the common foot-soldiers are divisible by their functions, as archers, swordsmen, etc., while some called the foot are in reality riders. Then, again, by quality we must divide into the generals and captains, into simple *prahārins* or fore-fighters (the especially brave, but not of rank), and the ordinary.

The captains, *balamukhyāḥ*, have already been referred to. Influential and of permanent rank (to bribe them in peace being recommended to the king, ii. 5. 59), they excel in peculiar knowledge and universal capacity (*sarvayuddhaviçāradāḥ*, R. ii. 109. 39). The fore-fighters* are either 'heroes' (*çūrāḥ*), or the latter's followers (*anugāḥ*, also *anucarāḥ*), who together lead the van; or a troop of brave but common men placed before others. Between the 'followers,' the *padānugāḥ* (viii. 96. 32, etc.) seem to be the common followers, and *anugāḥ* more the *socii* of the leading knight, as these terms are usually employed; though conversely *anugāḥ* may designate the whole army following. The 'army-guards,' *senāgopāḥ*, are special heroes, selected not as leaders of reserve, but as watchers of the wings and tail of the army, yet active in the fight.†

---

* Compare vi. 92. 20: vii. 111. 20, etc. Duryodhana is the king in all practice (see above, p. 83).

† The commander thus daring is 'goaded with word-weapons' by the king, vi. 98. 1–16. Constant 'goading' between king or knight and knight takes place. In vii. 189. 58 the king calls to his heroes: 'what are you standing there for, you fools; go on where the fighting is.' Kripa taunts Karṇa bitterly (as do all knights each other): 'oft hast thou fought, never hast thou conquered; talk not, but fight; thou tree without fruit, boast while thou seest the foe not,' vii. 158. 18 ff. Karṇa retorts on the priest (*vipra*, 29, is Kripa); the king intercedes, and at length pacifies them, 159. 13 ff. The commander thus vilifies a prince: 'thou art no man, thou art a slave-girl; be a servant, go and carry clothes' (*dāsī jitā 'si dyūte tvaṁ yathākāmacarī bhava, vāsasāṁ vāhikā rājño bhrātur jyeṣṭhasya me bhava*), and the prince retreats, 'pretending not to hear' (*çrutam açrutaṁ kṛtvā*, vii. 122. 4 ff.).

‡ vi. 57. 31; vii. 21. 54: the rule, like many, is not without exceptions.

The whole action of the army depends theoretically on the commander-in-chief; and although this is not so on the side of the Pāndus, where the to-be-lauded heroes are made most prominent, yet even here such consideration is shown for the position that it seems as if there were in this office a survival of one more important than it is. The commander is represented as all in all as regards defeat. At his fall the army is *ipso facto* routed.‡

The Guru-commander commands both by silence and by speech. None would dare to fight without being ordered by him (vii. 112. 14). But, especially in the election, other signs remain that the office of commander is a survival of the king's own office. The king is put forward more and more, not as a fighter, but as a 'friendly sign,' to encourage the soldiers, and his position in front is even thus casually explained.§

The early king was his own commander; the later commander-in-chief represented the dying military function of the now effeminate monarch. Thus written, from that later period the armies are both provided with a commander. But the Pāndus' commander is a figure-head, while that of the more advanced Kurus is all-important.

---

* Compare *praharatāṁ çreṣṭhāḥ prahāraṁ saṃpracakrire*, vi. 52. 1; 46. 13, etc.

† *senāgopaḥ*, vii. 163. 7; *senāgoptā*, ib. 10; *sāinikaḥ*, vii. 2. 9.

‡ Compare of Çalya's death the remark *tasmin hate hataṁ sarvam*, ix. 7. 37 (imitated R. vi. 44. 40, *hate tasmin hataṁ sarvaṁ taṁ haniṣyāmi*). Compare the passage vii. 122. 12 ff.: *vidrute tvayi sāinyasya nāyake ko 'nyaḥ sthāsyati*, and ib. 27. Çalya told the king to order a retreat as soon as Karṇa fell, viii. 95. 4. 'Without the leader the army cannot stand a moment,' vii. 5. 8.

§ Wilson's remark that the general remains in the rear (Works, iv. 305) is one of those theoretical statements that opening the Epic alone disproves. The 'sign,' literally 'well-marked,' vii. 34. 18, is a late and novel idea; but the idea of the king as a 'sun enveloped in clouds' (viii. 7. 16), i. e. as a spectator of battle, is common; it is, however, also late, and the fact that the Kuru king is more often represented thus, while the Pāndu king is more often an individual, independent fighter, points to their relative civilization. There were more prowess-deeds to record of one than of the other. A kingly survival in the commander's office may be found in the *vives* shouted at his election: *jīva, jahi çatrūn*; and the kingly word *anuçādhi kurūn* (used of a commander), ix. 7. 10; vii. 4. 11.

The general order of the day remains to be considered. It is ridiculously assumed that the battle-order of the morning is intact at night; and at the end of the eleventh day 'the two armies withdrew to camp, according to their divisions, their order, and their squads,' an absurd remark in face of the utter disorder of the whole day.*

What was the condition on the field in actual battle? There was no order whatever, after the first plunge into the fight. As soon as the armies meet, we read that there was complete disorder (e. g. vii. 187. 1–5). This is caused in two ways. The mass is helpless and imbecile, left to itself; the knight is reckless and foolhardy. Instead of remaining to attack the division allotted to him at the outset of the day, he rushes about wherever he pleases, and the slightest incident sends him shooting transversely across the field, discomforting his friends almost as much as his foes. The knightly proficiency in 'manœuvres,' either of weapon-skill or of chariot-skill, leads directly to this individual excellence and weakness of the mass. It is a combat of duels and push. Each knight flings himself in front of another, and the two then 'circle,' or wheel about each other, in the method admired by the Greek observers, until one is confused or weakened; for the charioteers do the twisting (except incidentally), while the knights have to keep their balance and shoot. As the cars constantly tip over, the shooting must have been, as described, rather wild. Meanwhile the regiments led by the knights into the field either stand stock-still and look on at the spectacle, or they fling themselves against each other, two unheeded masses, and, cutting and chopping each other in a promiscuous manner, lend their weight against the foe. More than weight we can scarcely call it. No individual common man is important. While this by-play goes on, one knight is slain or flees. Then all his soldiers run away, since they fight not for a cause but for a leader. *Principes pro victoria pugnant, comites pro principe.*†

---

* vii. 17. 1: *yathābhāgaṁ yathānyāyaṁ yathāgulmaṁ ca* (*nyaviçetāṁ te sene*). The 'array' may be used of a small part; a 'counter-array' is a term applied even to a sudden stand against a body of elephants: each chief has his own 'array' (vii. 96.8; 98. 28).

† The manœuvres, *mārga*, are made by all the army at the opening of the fourteenth day: that is, the troops advance exhibiting their dexterity in whirling weapons, etc. In vii. 122. 73, after a spirited conflict, each champion returns to his own array,' which had stood by looking on; but generally the duel takes place in the midst of the foot-soldiers.

Some idea of the confusion as depicted may be gathered from the constant references to the rushing of war-cars and the trampling of elephants and cavalry, which are themselves employed to 'box in' a knight, and from the descriptions of the general fighting: extracts from which will counteract the theoretical 'order' of the poet, both of course the offspring of his imagination, but one evidently from imagining a code in practice, the other from the actual practices of the field.[*] 'There was darkness and noise; invisible became heaven, earth, and points of the horizon; blinded with dust were the soldiers.' Again: 'No knights now shun each other; without law or order they fight; with their own fathers, with their own sons.' The field is one where 'double thousands of chariots, elephants, horses, and foot are contending;' where 'seas of war-cars' rush; where 'father knew not son, nor son father;' where 'none could say "this is I," but father fought with son, friend slew friend, the mother's brother slew his sister's son; each slew his own; lawless was the fight.'[†]

In spite of all this, we are told that strict order prevailed, and that, in accordance with the rule (explained in the next paragraph), every knight sought to kill a knight, every elephant was pitted just against an elephant, no foot-man fought but with one of his kind.[‡]

---

[*] The 'boxing in' of a knight by means of elephants and cavalry is described, e. g. in vii. 171. 2 ff.: *parivavruḥ samantataḥ, enaṁ koṣṭhakīkṛtya sarvataḥ*, literally 'enchambering.'

[†] The first quotation in vii. 186. 20, 12 ff.; 'double thousands' in vi. 45. 81; 111. 14 (*rathavañçāḥ*); the sea-simile, with 'foam of flag,' etc., vii. 99, 46–53; 'sons and fathers,' etc., vi. 48. 24; 102. 5; 'mother's brother,' vii. 169. 47 ff.

[‡] vi. 45. 83; so earlier, iv. 32. 9–10, and often. The following quotations will illustrate some of the points above. 'A hero that showing his manliness stands at the head of the army should be bought for a thousand,' says the Nīti (as quoted v. 57. 55: *yaḥ tiṣṭhed agrataḥ*). The common footmen do nothing without the 'headman' to direct them (*mukhya*, vii. 170. 46). All the forces, once in action, fight over the field indiscriminately. There is nothing to show that the cavalry fought exclusively as dependent aiders of the chariots (compare vi. 45. 87: *tatra tatra pradṛçyante rathavāraṇapatayaḥ sādinaç ca . . yudhyamānāḥ*). The proper way to fight is to have every foot-soldier fight with his kind; so with elephant-fighters, cavalry, and chariot-men (vii. 169. 40). But, as one knight is expected to be conversant with all four forms (vii. 165. 9, and often), and is generally represented as shooting indiscriminately, and as the soldiers with hooks were stationed in such a way as to pull at the men in armor, it is improbable that this formula was ever put into effect. Especially the commander was expected to know every kind of fighting; but Vedic knowledge is also prized. When Droṇa is consecrated (vii. 5. 12 ff.), he is called into the midst of the army (6. 1 ff.), and eulogized before receiving the *senāpatitva* (5. 13); he then says: 'I know the Veda and the six limbs of the Veda; I know the *mānavī vidyā*, the *trāiyambaka iṣvastra* (divine science of bow and arrow), and the various weapons. But Droṇa was, as said by the Epic itself, a great rarity. The commander makes his own stipulations: thus, Droṇa will

The 'door of the array' is probably an opening in the ranks. The 'door-place' of a camp is familiar (*dvāradeça*, x. 5. 40), but in battle this seems to be only an exit in the chariot-line of circumvallation, made for example at the beginning of the day, as when Droṇa goes out and looks at the foe's array, and then returns to 'the door of his array' (vii. 117. 34); or stands there,

---

not kill the Pāndu (vii. 7. 7); Bhīshma will not kill Çikhandin; etc. The confusion in the field is illustrated by a few out of many citations. 'They fight with teeth and nails and feet' (vi. 96. 45); and the strife is one of 'hair-pulling,' for 'tooth to tooth and nail to nail they fought; with feet and arms the fight went on' (viii. 49. 80). Such fear smites the fighters that they void excrements in terror (vi. 99. 26 *et passim*). Joy as well as terror marks the confusion: 'such joy came upon them that all the bands of creatures there rejoiced in flesh and blood, drinking the blood of the wounded' (viii. 52. 36). The fallen lay 'hunting for water' (*mṛgayāṁ cakrire jalaṁ*, vi. 46. 39). The great hosts 'reel with all their warriors' (*loḍyate rathịbhiḥ . . vāhinī*, vi. 111. 58); 'like a ship broken in the deep' appears the army (vii. 2. 1; 5. 8; 45. 6–8); and 'the battle is one of shrieks and screams; a glorious strife, the increaser of the realm of the God of death'; for 'absolute confusion reigns, and men, elephants, cars, all alike are involved in destruction' (vii. 169. 47; 25. 21, *utpiñjalikaṁ yuddham;* ib. 32. 75, *sukalilaṁ yamarāṣṭravivardhanam:* cf. vi. 118. 4). Let us follow those scenes a little further, where 'the sound of the bow-string, the hail of hands beaten, the lighting of club and of sword,' are depicted (vii. 101. 27). No expression occurs more often than this: 'then arose a din tumultuous' (*tumulaḥ çabdaḥ:* e. g. vii. 157. 31); and to explain it we have the shouts and cries attempted in language: *halahala*, *hāhā*, are the sounds on all sides (vi. 47. 63; 48. 82). A more minute picture is presented: 'everywhere were heard the cries "stand," "I am standing," "smite him," "turn," "be firm," "firm am I," "strike out;" and one cried for help "son;" and another, "brother;" another, "friend;" another, "cousin;" another, "comrade;" another, "brother of my mother;" and they shouted: "do not desert me," "come on," "advance," "why fearest?" "whither goest?" "fear not"' (vi. 59. 8, 18, 19). Here, as elsewhere (see above, p. 141, note) the *mātula*, mother's brother, is the uncle called upon. Compare the 'lawless strife' of ix. 9. 36 ff., where all abandoned their sons, brothers, grandsires, brothers of the mother, sons of the sister (46). Such exhortations are strewn everywhere; such scenes are found on almost every page, mixed with more regular official exhortations, such as 'fight ye now,' and the calm response ''tis well,' 'all right' (*yudhyadhvam; sādhu; bāḍham;* vi. 59. 18 ff.; 95. 46; 90. 52, etc.). A ludicrous tinge is often given, as where one hero gives a fearful yell, and the other 'could not endure that lion-roar,' and consequently made a still greater noise himself, so that 'all the army was frightened and ran away' (vi. 54. 36). The knights rush on 'like tigers, licking their lips' (vi. 96. 22; 111. 11). The chief legitimate noise, beside that of 'hundreds of bells' (vii. 175. 11), comes from conch-shell, trumpet, tom-tom, and the like. As observed already, music begins the day; for 'where the drum and pipe is silent there will be no victory' (vii. 85. 24). Thus Arjuna notices its absence when his son is slain (vii. 72. 11). The instruments are discussed below. Now and then, but rarely, amid these tones of horror and confusion that are unpoetically reproduced, we find a true poetic touch. Thus, we have a fine bit or two that may be worth quoting, lest the reader think the battles are nothing but hubbubs. A knight cries out to another in mid-battle: 'Press on; let heaven be thy leader. For glory and for victory, press on' (vi. 112. 28); and a conflict is de-at the *vyūhadvāra*, to fight (ib. 128. 19).* This is perhaps the same as the five-fold *randhra* (Ag. P. 241. 40) of a battle-line.

The method of signalling over the field was (to send a messenger, or) by banner or horn. The flags on each car showed who was fighting, as the symbols were well known; but in case the dust of battle obscured the fight, the knights intimated their proximity by their horns and shells, each knight being recognizable by the noise he made. Further, the peculiar yell or war-whoop of each served to reveal his presence. Often the driver is told to 'drive where the noise is,' or to 'drive where the sound of arrows is' (vii. 171. 12); but generally the car is driven to meet a particular sound of one horn or voice.

In the pseudo-Epic the chief array described seems to be a *senāyoga* or marching-order, more fitted for an armed caravan than for a troop entering the field, a line of swordsmen being in front, wagons behind, and the women in the centre.† A comparison of Epic practice with pseudo-Epic and Puranic precept shows that in the latter case the four-faced army is now frequently assumed as sixfold, but differently defined according to kind of fighters, and age, disposition, etc., of the same; that the general rule for the commander-in-chief is to go where the danger is; the queen and the king with the treasure are to be in the middle (*yatra rājā tatra koçaḥ*), with the *phalgu sāiṇyam;* the cavalry occupies the wings or centre, on their flank are the chariots, behind these the elephants. The orders of battle are now distributed in such manner that the *makara*, *çyena*, and *sūcī* arrays are used when the attack is from the front; the *çakaṭa* and *vajra*, when from the rear. An *anīkam* or acies is reckoned equal to nine elephants with accompaniments. The soldier that sleeps on his post by day is to be

---

scribed thus: 'Pure in heart, with death before, and heaven their leader, they fought a noble fight' (vii. 189. 8). Again, we have a spirited comparison: 'who meet the Pāndus in the fight, they return not, even as rivers return not from the sea; but they that turn aside, like unbelievers from the Vedas, like them shall go to hell' (vii. 101. 3 ff.). Such expressions as 'the lightning of club and sword' (vii. 101. 27), 'arrows like swans pursued by hawks' (vii. 137. 27, and 139. 33), 'destructive as death' (*pretarāṭ*, viii. 14. 17); and exhortations, as in the following: 'where is thy mind, and where thy pride, where thy manhood and where thy *thunder?*' (vii. 122. 9, *garjitam*)—serve to lighten the heavy cumbrous description.

* I think *pūrvadvāra* is thus used occasionally for an opening in the van, but cannot cite a passage. The 'array' in vii. 124 is merely a crowd.

† xii. 100. 43 ff. In this passage Brihaspati's rule, already given, is quoted. In ib. 99, 9 the order of victory, or fighting array, is obtained by putting the knights in the midst of the elephants; the *anusādinaḥ* or cavalry in the midst of the knights; and next to them, the foot. The battle-rules in ib. 96. 3 (compare 100. 26) = M. vii. 91 are the schematic rules against cruelty. In 96. 4 the slaves of war, enslaved for a year, are mentioned.

beaten; by night, to be killed (either trampled to death by elephants or beheaded). A deserter is to be killed, 'like a beast.' The soldiers are to be rewarded from the king's treasury for special acts of bravery, such as killing the hostile king or crown-prince. A distribution of proper opponents sets three horses and fifteen foot to an elephant. The *vyūha* has seven formal divisions, including the reserve (*pratigraha*). The *gomūtrikā* is recognized as a formal *vyūha*. The special object of chariots is here described as splitting up infantry-lines, and their possible absence from battle is noted. Further numerical particularities and un-Epic divisions of the army, e. g. *bhoga*, are useful to compare only with the Nītisāra (K. Nīt. 19. 30; 41. 53, etc.)* and kindred works.

Holtzmann would reduce the eighteen days of fighting described by our present Epic to three; but there seems to me no necessity for rejecting Droṇa entirely, although this *parvan* has been greatly expanded and filled in with repetitions. The four days obtainable by reckoning one to each commander on the Kuru side bear no further analogy to the four days of fighting about Troy than in their number, and casual similarities incidental to poetic narration.

I have said that strategy is almost confined to tactics in the Hindu army. These tactics, in one final word, give us two leading principles of battle: first, fighting is to be done by soldiers arrayed in groups, not in extended lines; second, concentrated forces are absolutely necessary in attacking a larger number of men; these concentrated forces should be arrayed in one long column of groups of combatants. The first of these is seen in the practice, the second in the precepts, of the Epic. The only strategical rule formally expressed is 'let one know his enemy.'

5. *The laws of battle.*—The 'law of conflict' is made like a treaty, and is said to have been formally proclaimed before the war began. Let us examine this. We find it broken through the whole war. We find practically no reference made to it. When its principles are broken, if the crime is reproved, it is not said 'the treaty was broken,' but 'the eternal right was destroyed;' and such cases of reproof are rare, and affect only a portion of the treaty, while the breaking of other portions passes unnoticed. It is therefore, as its very formality shows, a late but interesting document. It reads as follows (vi. 1. 27 ff.): Article one: Knights must contend in an orderly manner, and may not use their weapons against non-combatants ('who

---

* xii. 97. 28. Rājanīti, 241 (note verses 1 and 2: *ṣaḍvidham balam. māula, bhūta, çreṇi, suhṛd, dviṣad, āṭavika; ṣaḍaṅgam. mantra, koça, padāti, āçva, ratha, dvipa*).

enter the fight to fight with the voice alone must be fought by the voice alone'). Article two: They that retire from the conflict must be permitted to go (unharmed). Article three: Those only of like sort may contend together: charioteer must attack charioteer; elephant-riders, elephant-riders; horsemen, horsemen; foot-soldiers, foot-soldiers. Article four: Notice must be given before striking; and no knight shall attack an enemy that is disabled, that appeals for mercy, that is in distress or perplexity, that is already engaged with a third party, that chances to be without armor or weaponless. A note is added specifying that those inviolate are charioteers (or heralds), weapon-carriers, horn-blowers, drummers.

This last law is frequently violated by the best knights on both sides. Arjuna is most blamed, but he has ample provocation, his own son having been deceitfully slain. As already shown, he is made to do no wrong, even in killing Karṇa; and in the earlier book (though later in time) he is made to say, in the spirit of this law, to the suppliants whom he has conquered: 'Not I wish to kill those distressed, I will comfort you' (iv. 67. 5). In the tone of this rule is also (vi. 107. 77 ff.): 'It is not a fair fight when one contends with another who has cast away his arms, or who is fallen, or whose armor or standard is broken, or who runs away, or who is afraid, or who surrenders, saying "I am thine," or who is a woman, or who bears a woman's name, or who is devoid of strength (skill? *vikala*), or who has only one son, or who is not forewarned (*apraçasta*, not 'unesteemed').' In general terms, 'the warrior that does not cease at a proper time for mercy is hated by all creatures, and destroyed here and hereafter (iii. 27. 40; cf. v. 33. 50). This is the warrior-law known of old by the great-hearted gods, and is contrasted with the sneaking 'laws of wild tribes' (*dasyudharma*). Included among those that may not be slain are, by universal rule, a woman, a child, an old man, or in fact anyone unable to contend.* One defenseless, whether met in open fight, or coming in battle or to one's house as a suppliant, received the sacred right of protection—the right of a suppliant (i. 170. 36, 42); and there are further general limitations (ii. 41. 13 ff.) in regard to slaying women, cows, priests, hosts, suppliants. If in war this 'suppliant's right' is taken advantage of, the saved suppliant becomes the dependent of the savior, the latter is now his Guru (ii. 38. 7; see above, pp. 104, 107, notes). But the Epic came before the law; and one chief hero slays a foe that stands 'with face averted,' another engaged with a third, another who surrenders. So it is quoted as a 'marvel' that Bhīma once refrained from slaying his foe fallen on the ground (i. 190. 29, *āçcaryam . . cakāra . . pātitam bhūmāu nā 'vadhīt*). The doctrine is old, the practice is natural, and naturally older than the kindly rule. The suppliant is, outside of the fever of battle, never injured; but as to the battle-rules, when Bhīshma fights as commander, we find him at one time alone attacked by ten men together (vi. 113. 2). When flung from his chariot (vi. 48. 95), Bhīshma is 'attacked by all together;' 'conjoined rows of fighters' once charged at him (vi. 89. 16 ff.). So much for the morality in this point on one side. Bhīshma leads the Kurus. But the Pāndu heroes are equally made the subject of universal attack. We find Irāvan in a like position: 'One with many he fought, nor did he waver' (vi. 90. 37). Arjuna, too, defends himself with 'divine weapons' (vi. 117. 36). Such also had his opponents. In one place (vi. 58. 2 ff.) they all fought against Arjuna, flinging at him every kind of weapon—and that too when they have 'walled him in' (*koṣṭhakīkṛtya*); 'but he, the great hero, warded off that rain of grasshoppers' (*vṛṣṭiḥ çalabhānāṁ*). Again (vi. 52. 39) they all attacked Arjuna together, crying 'bah! to knightly rules' (*dhik kṣātraṁ dharmam*). Bhīma also was attacked by four at once, who threw knives and darts at him (vi. 113. 39). As if to certify that the allusion to 'knightly rules' was but a proleptic addition, we find often such admissions as are conveyed by the astonishment at the feat of the one hero: 'a wonder we saw then, how one fought with many' (vi. 74. 22; and ib. 75. 36, 'how all fought with one'). It is a cause of great reproof to Arjuna that he fought unfairly. No knight had more provocation. Arjuna's own son was foully murdered, and that by full-grown chiefs, while he was but a boy of sixteen. He was deprived of his battle-car, surrounded, and deliberately knocked on the head with a club: 'he fought alone in the fight, and was slain alone by many'; 'he the mere boy, the boy-hearted' (vii. 49. 14; 51. 13; 52. 3). As the son was foully slain to dishearten the father, so every means was taken to destroy unfairly the latter. 'Even in the rear he was surrounded by barbarians' at the opposing king's express command (while fighting with Karna: viii. 81. 1 ff.). The Kurus' great hero, who unites the virtues of a Nestor with the dullness of a Hesiod, has a very simple rule in fighting: 'fight fairly (*ārjavena*) with every one; but if one employs trickery, employ trickery' (*māyāvī*: v. 193. 10). Karṇa sinks to death because the model hero of the Pāndus violates the rule that it is not fair to shoot a foe unable to defend himself. So terrible appeared this violation, that God is made to prompt him to the act; he does not really wish to kill

---

* vii. 143. 8; 156. 2; viii. 69. 26; 93. 9; 90. 111 ff.; iii. 18. 13. Cf. the same in xii. 95. 7 ff.; 96. 3, with later additions; and in Manu and other law-books.

Karna; thus 'he is noble and abides by his manly duty' (viii. 90. 70); but God, Indrāvaraja, says 'slay now,' and he regretfully does so. But he need not have scrupled. One of his foes, a very worthy priest-knight, beholding a warrior wounded and defenseless lying in the bottom of his car, immediately smote the unfortunate one 'with many arrows, eager to slay.' Thus did the worthy Kripa (vii. 169. 31). He was not much worse than Arjuna's demoniac nephew, who slays the unslayable Alambusha, flings him to the ground, cuts off his head, and casts it into the chariot of the dead man's king (vii. 174. 40). Examine the night battle; it does not need the words of the text to tell us, yet they do tell us, that no rules of battle were observed (vii. 169. 50). 'Rules of good men,' even 'rules of heroes,' are alluded to (*vīradharma*, vi. 59. 81–82), but we notice that whenever a hero 'makes up his mind to fight in an Aryan way,' he violates all 'laws' of magnanimity. The real meaning of fighting in an Aryan or noble way is to rush amid the foes and fight to the death, sparing no one.*

The God of the Pāndus advises Arjuna (who will not consent, but others eagerly do) to 'put away all right,' and try to kill the commander-in-chief opposing by tricking him into believing that his son is dead. The king of the Pāndus agrees to this, and the silly trick is performed.† The same expression of 'rejecting right' is used again when a whole corps is disbanded (vii. 192. 83). It seems, therefore, that right was a vague thing, a sentiment of uncertain honor rather than a rule, and could be violated without much compunction on either side. Later the law, or the later sentiment formulated in law, forbids what was done, and tries to cloak it. No authority is given for such rules. The rule is given that a king should fight with a king (*rājā rājñā yoddhavyaḥ*), but, except by accident, no such rule is observed (vii. 162. 49–50). It is applied only when king meets king, which, of course, often happens; but as often the king contends with an inferior.

As a general thing, very sensible explanations are given of the reason why 'irregular' acts are done. Arjuna cut off Bhūriçravas's arm while the latter was contending with a friend of Arjuna. The 'rule' of chivalry is that when two men are fighting a third shall not interfere. How does Arjuna excuse himself? He says: Bhūriçravas was on the war-path, and tried to kill my friend; in war there is no law; fathers even kill their own sons, etc.; I should, indeed, have sinned if I had neglected my friend, for he needed my help; I therefore cut off his antagonist's arm; it is silly to talk about 'fighting with one person only'; how can one man be always fighting with one only? how could there be any real conflict if one were to fight with one?[*]

---

* *āryāṁ yuddhe matiṁ kṛtvā*, vi. 86. 31; vii. 22. 2; compare vi. 88. 44. Also R. vi. 16. 72 (idem).

† Droṇa is easily made to believe the story of his son's death, for he thinks that 'a Pāndu cannot tell a lie.' The excuse for this act is, that 'a man is not besmirched with a lie told for life's sake,' here wrested to mean 'told for the sake of a foe's death:' vii. 190. 11. 43, 47. Arjuna wished to capture him alive, but they cut his head off: ib. 192. 63 ff.; 193. 63. This scene is, however, plainly an interpolation.

The especial reputation of Arjuna's elder brother rests on his cruelty; he is Bhīma, the fear-maker; his son is but half human (vi. 110. 13). The frequent exercise of 'shooting into open wounds' as a test of skill conveys an idea of the normal atrocities practiced (viii. 90. 66, and often).

Droṇa cries out to Karṇa 'make the boy turn his head, and then hit him'; who did as he was told, and, after slaying the youth's steeds, attacked him with the help of six other men (vii. 48. 29 ff.).

The *ātatāyin*-rule permits one to kill anybody that tries to take his life.[†] The formal list of those 'not to be killed' is often given; but if, for instance, it be the duty of the elephant-riders 'to catch by the hair and cut the head off' (vi. 57. 14), are we to suppose that these agile monkeys waited to see if the man over whom they tramped was in proper condition, or 'had a son,' or fulfilled other requisites of an object of slaughter? Or is it the noble knight for whom these rules are made? But tenderness was unmanly. Arjuna grieves over the death of his old teacher, but Bhīma cries out at him: 'lo, he talks like a priest; . . a knight lives in destruction. . . Compassion is for women . . . but a warrior is by name a destroyer,' etc. (vii. 197. 4). Absolute destruction is the aim of all in the field. 'To die in battle and to escape a foe—that is the highest joy, and this the highest crime' (viii. 93. 55 ff., 59; the same in ix. 3. 57; 4. 10). This is the real *dharma*, or rule of knightly right. But we have a theoretical *dharma*, a theoretical 'Āryan-fight'; and in such a case (referred to above) it is carefully explained that 'on this occasion they did not use barbed or poisoned arrows.' But here the veil drawn over the old battle is too thin to hide it; for barbed and poisoned arrows were used throughout the war.

The knights 'know polity' (viii. 10. 14), and can quote the wrong doings of their adversaries; but when they do so, it is regarded as sufficient answer to hold up the list of 'wrong' acts perpetrated by the accuser and his party. Tit for tat is apology enough (vii. 198; viii. 91. 1 ff.) Right is revenge. It is acclared to be so in so many words, as Justice is declared to be a weak god. 'The wise say that Justice protects one; ever have I been just, but Justice protects me not; Justice destroys its devotees, but never protects'—so speaks the great Kuru (viii. 90. 87). 'I shall pay my debts to my fathers and to my mother,' cries Bhīma; or again: 'I shall be clear of debt to my dead father'—these words mean that the speaker is about to revenge himself or avenge his parents—this was his 'right' (vi. 91. 26; vii. 195. 21).

---

[*] *ekasyāi 'kena hi kathaṁ saṁgrāmaḥ sambhaviṣyati*, vii. 143. 28. This conduct is contrasted with *āryakarma*, vs. 10.

[†] Given in vi. 107. 101; literal use in ix. 11. 11, 'attacking'; with twisted application, x. 1. 53.

As a general rule, a knight is killed without mercy. We saw above, however, that Arjuna wishes to capture Droṇa alive, or rather to spare him; and so Duryodhana requests Droṇa himself not to kill Yudhishthira, but to capture him alive and bring him before him.* Those 'fated to be killed by one' are avoided by others (vii. 123. 36). And, not to say there is no magnanimity, let us close these typical passages by one rare, and in its rarity worth noticing. Karṇa does not take the life of Nakula who has attacked him; he disarms, but does not slay. Giving him his life, he says, 'Go now, fight with thy equals; depart.' So the knight 'ready to die was spared by Karṇa; and he returned, ashamed' (viii. 24. 48 ff.).

Must we also regard the private compacts as late? These are taken in self-defense, or to promote joint action. The most famous is the great conspiracy. At the close of the eleventh day, the Kurus resolve on slaying Arjuna as best they may. They 'make an oath in respect of the battle' (*kṛtvā çapatham āhave*), to the effect that they will all attack Arjuna together, and they will kill him or go to hell. On making this vow, they consummate it by a libation and sacrifice. First they seize the holy *kuça*-grass garments, with girdles of *mūrv*, and then they swear their 'oath of war' (*raṇavrata*). Against magic they put on these *kuça*-grass garments; and then they bind on their armor, after they have anointed with ghee. Then comes the oath, and they swear 'by glory and victory,' 'by rich sacrifices,' 'in the name of all the gods, and worlds, and hells; and in the hearing of all existent things'—standing over the consecrated fire: 'may we go to the world of the evil ones if we do not kill him, or if not killing him we retire.' Then they go out and challenge Arjuna (*āhvayantaḥ*, 'call him out'), who responds by his own oath: 'A vow have I taken, and this is my vow: that challenged in conflict I ne'er shall retire' (vii. 17. 18–39). The challenge is here given after the *avahāra* or formal return to camp.† Such pledges of mutual support are given between the chiefs elsewhere, as in the case of Çalya, who agrees with a friend thus: 'we will make an agreement; we will mutually protect us; let him of us be guilty of the five cardinal sins, and all the little sins, who fights alone (not aiding), or deserts when fighting (ix. 8. 8 ff.). But we find the king reproved later for breaking this agreement, and urged to go forward and help (ix. 18. 20).

---

* *jīvagrāhaṁ gṛhītvā . . . . matsamīpam ihā 'naya*, vii. 12. 6.

† In like manner Arjuna himself curses himself 'by all the worlds,' etc., if he fail to kill Jayadratha (vii. 73. 24 ff.). So Dhrishtadyumna

Little private vows are frequent. One makes a vow (*vrata*) never to have his back pierced with arrows (v. 185. 25–6). Another 'vows the vow of the devils' (*āsura*), which is 'never to have his feet washed nor to eat meat until he kill Arjuna' (iii. 257. 14). Another swears to drink his foe's heart's blood, and fulfils it twelve years later.* An early case binds a man to kill any one that draws blood from his king, except in war—this is also a 'vow' (iv. 68. 55).

Alongside of 'wrong-fighting' we may put boasting. This is declared to be un-Aryan; but there is no warrior who boasts more than he that quotes the rule—though it would be difficult to say which of all the chiefs was the greatest braggart.† Only one pure regulation seems to be felt as binding on the Aryans, and that is not found in the formally adopted code. There is a general fighting rule, quoted as 'a decision of the *çāstra*' (or legal work), to the effect that 'one must not strike below the navel';‡ and any violation of this rule results in the violater's being stigmatized as 'crooked and un-Aryan.' He ultimately, it is observed, will go to hell. As this is the only rule quoted as 'legal' (opposed to vague 'rules of right'), and as there is no excuse at all offered for the person that breaks it, it seems as if it might really be an old fighting-rule. At any rate, to believe this does not involve our believing in the strained courtesy of the other rules, although the early codes may have taught consideration for helpless persons in general terms. Such a simple law may well have been generally adopted, and is in accordance with the uncorrupted Aryan morality still preserved on our side in the Anglo-Saxon contempt for one that 'strikes below the belt.'

6. *The army-forces in detail.*—I proceed to discuss the parts of the army as shown to us by the Epic.

---

curses 'him that fails to slay Droṇa, or him that Droṇa overcomes,' with the words: 'may he be deprived of his hopes' fulfilment, of his warriorship, and of his religious rights' (vii. 186. 45 ff.). Not succeeding in this, his opponent taunts him 'especially weak in failing after cursing before kings' (ib. 53).

* viii. 83. 28; 84. 11: compare vii. 137. 28, etc.; R. v. 82. 19. N. interprets *āsura* above as *a-surā*, abstinence from wine.

† *āryeṇa hi na vaktavyā kadā cit stutir ātmanaḥ*, vii. 195. 21.

‡ *adho nābhyā na hantavyam iti çāstrasya niçcayaḥ*, ix. 60. 6, 28; 61. 28, 38.

The general term for all that is carried by the troops is *vāhana*, 'luggage, that which is carried.'

The arms may be generally divided into those of offense and those of defense.

The arsenal I have already spoken of; it was a chief object of care: a large building described as built near to the city wall, where, every morning, the king goes and inspects personally the condition of the arms.*

I discuss first the knight and his chariot; then the cavalry and elephants; next the arms of the knights, together with the arms of the lower classes; the defensive armor; and last, the trappings of war, and music.

The knight in his chariot fights wholly for himself, and alone, except when helping a friend, and then generally by shooting from a distance. If he be a *rājaputra*, one of his chief duties, however, is to guard dangerous places and keep watch over the king.†

Comparing the Epic and Vedic ages, we find in the Epic the arms of defense equally developed with those of offense, whereas in the Veda the former seem more deficient, not only in construction but also in number. The Vedic hero rides in a two-wheeled chariot, and his chief weapon (*āyudha*) is the bow (*dhanvan*), not straight, but already bent before use. To this was added one string of leather (*jyā*), and the arrow (*iṣu*), which was drawn not to the breast but to the ear. The names of these weapons are the same in Indo-Iranian, and in part appear pan-Aryan,‡ though other national names are given: e. g. *bāṇa*, 'reed;' *çarya*, later *çalya*, 'dart.' The left hand was already protected with a leather strap. The arrows were feathered, and often poisoned; tipped with horn or metal, and preserved in a quiver (*iṣudhi*, *niṣaṅga*). Besides this, the warriors had spears (*ṛṣṭi*), and, perhaps, short swords (*kṛti*); while to heavenly powers the singers attributed *jūrṇi*, perhaps lightning only, and the axe (*paraçu*), though not disdaining the throwing of rocks. In defense the Vedic warrior carried the 'defender' (*varman*): a word common to the Vedic and Iranic. This covered his shoulders, and was either made of metal wire or covered with metal, while for the head he carried a helm of several pieces. But except for the leather strap protecting the left arm from the bow-string, no other defense was worn, unless we accept a doubtful reference from which some protection of the feet has been, with no certainty, assumed.

---

* *āyudhāgāraṁ vaprāntam*, i. 147. 13; *sāṁgrāmika* and *āyudhāgāra* are the usual terms. Personal supervision of the king, see duties, above; and compare i. 194. 14, where a king passes by every treasure of wealth in order to visit the arsenal.

† Compare vii. 34. 14, where a *saṁghāto rājaputrāṇāṁ sarveṣām* is made about the place of danger.

‡ The arrow, Sanskrit *iṣu*=Avestan *iṣu*=Greek ἰός. Bow and bowstring are Indo-Iranian.

Such is the picture presented by the Vedic knight, the earliest Aryan warrior.[*] We have now, with this as an introduction, to see what developments took place before the Epic period. We shall see that there is some difference between the two periods, as well as between the Epic and the post-Epic and more artificial age in which the art of war was demonstrated theoretically. In the latter case we find, for instance, as if a museum were described, that bows are made of metal, horn, or wood; that the string is of bark or animal membrane, the pat or lute plant, or of hemp or flax; that there are two or three strings to a bow, which is again said to be just six feet in length, etc.[†]

A. *The chariot.*—The earliest chariot was a car of two or three wheels, and with one, two, or three horses; in the Epic we find the same, or one of four, sometimes eight, wheels; and with two, three, or four horses, or (in the latest portions) eight.

In particulars, we find the Vedic war-car, *ratha*, placed on a box, *koça*, fixed on a wooden axle, *akṣa*, fastened by cowhide thongs. The seat, *bandhura*, is single; in the case of gods, three to eight seats, as fancy dictates, are mentioned. The knight stands on the floor of the car, *garta*, to the left of his driver. A rim is perhaps to be assumed as protecting the car, called *aṅka*, perhaps comparable etymologically with ἄντυξ.[‡] The wheel-spokes are of wood. A banner-pole stands erect in the car.[§] A horse stands on each side of the pole, and the two are yoked, guided by a bit, *çiprā*, and reins, while urged by a goad (or whip). Only Indra has a *caturyuga*, *τέτρωρον ἅρμα*. One horse in shafts was a sign of poverty. The car and pole were decorated. Axe and bow were the chief weapons, but knives and others smaller are used. Many warriors fight on foot; also 'riders' are mentioned, but not regular cavalry. This is all we know with certainty of the Hindu chariot before the Epic.

---

[*] Drawn from Zimmer's *Alt. Leben*, pp. 298 ff.

[†] The regular divisions of the later schemes will be found Ag. P. 248. 1 ff.; see Wilson iv. 292 ff. According to this, the whole body of arms falls into five classes: 1. *yantramukta*; 2. *pāṇimukta*; 3. *muktāmukta*; 4. *amukta*; 5. natural weapons, fists, etc.; and fuller theoretical accounts of still later origin may be found in Oppert's publications, where also the Hindu gun, cannon, and other quite modern arms are described in Sanskrit verses even later than Kāmandaki's. To Mbh. i. 221. 72 (quoted above, p. 111) the commentator defines *catuṣpāda* (applied with *daçavidha* to the *dhanurveda*) as *mantramukta*, *pāṇimukta*, *muktāmukta*, *amukta*, giving only four scheduled classes, for here we have ten sorts (*vidha*) of fighting, and four kinds of weapons as the 'feet;' while the Agni Purāṇa gives the 'four feet' as kinds of fighters (chariot, elephant, horse, and foot), the (five) 'sorts' as the arms explained above.

[‡] Bezzenberger, quoted by Zimmer, loc. cit., 251. The related *aṅkuça* means hook or guard: compare the use of *kaṅkaṭa*, vii. 187. 47: *nyaṅkāu* with *aṅkāu* in Pār. G. S. iii. 14. 6.

[§] Pār. G. S. iii. 14. 13, *stambha*.

Three drivers might stand on the broad shelf that ran in front of the largest Epic war-car (*ratha*, rarely *yāna*, wagon).* In the rear stood the knight. To shoot directly in front he leaned over a fence-rim between the belly of the car and the horses, of which in this case four were used; or mules instead were employed. Each chariot is stocked with arms, and many more are borne behind by attendants. Over each war-car stood an emblem-pole, and shone silk-emblazoned banners with woven or painted figures of allegorical import.† A covering over the largest war-cars protected from the direct rays of the sun, a covering used as well on the field as on a march (*ātapatra:* xv. 23. 8).

Over against this view of the large four-horse chariot, we have the simpler picture of a two-horse car, small in size, containing only the knight and one attendant, the charioteer. This car was much smaller, and, indeed, Homeric; for, as in the Iliad one man seeks to pick up and run away with a chariot, so we find here a knight attempting to lift a war-car alone out of a morass. Outside of the war proper we find the chariot-duel.‡ Of course impromptu meetings of two chariots and the subsequent strife between the occupants are of frequent occurrence in the battle scenes;§ but it is significant that, apart from the field of actual battle, a king proposes in one of the early books to recover his kingdom by instituting 'a duel in chariots' between his adversary and himself, the result of which shall establish peace.‖

---

* Wilson's description (iv. 290 ff.) is in general correct. He is further right in saying that the account of six men in each war-car described in Porus' battle "does not seem to be correct." Megasthenes' account does not weigh well with the native. Lassen is wrong in saying that in the Epic only one charioteer and one archer is mentioned for one car (i. 159). Rājendralālamitra has vainly sought to make probable the carrying of scythes on the early Hindu war-car (Indo-Ar. i. 342). The chariot can easily carry five persons besides the drivers, but only on festal occasions, in a triumphal march, or on a journey in a state car, not in battle (xii. 37. 37).

† In Greek the ἐπισήμια of the shields were invented by the Karians; those in India were represented by the banner-emblems.

‡ *ratha* may be for war (*sāṁgrāmiko rathaḥ*) or for peace (*krīḍārathaḥ*), xiii. 53. 28.

§ *dvāirathaṁ yudhyatām*, vii. 173. 61; *bahūni dvāirathāni* (*yuddhāni*), vi. 83. 1; *dvandvayuddham* (*kartum icchāmi*, i. 136. 15) is the general 'duel': cf. *apratidvandvatāṁ yuddhe*, iii. 116. 18; *dvandvayuddham avāpnuvan*, vi. 48. 14; compare *yuddhaṁ dvāiratham*, R. vi. 86. 27 (and 91. 1). The challenge to duel is given in R. vi. 58. 17 ff., beginning *tiṣṭha rāma mayā sārddhaṁ dvandvayuddham prayaccha me, tyājayiṣyāmi te prāṇān dhanurmuktāiḥ çitāiḥ çarāiḥ.*

‖ *dvāirathenā 'stu vāi çāntiḥ*, iii. 78. 8.

The number of charioteers depends on the horses. When two horses are sufficient, one *sārathi* or charioteer is sufficient also. In the case of four horses (two fastened to the pole, two by straps outside, not tandem: *dhur* and *pārṣṇi*), we have one charioteer in the middle, who guides the pole-horses, and on each side of him the two drivers of the outer steeds, *pārṣṇisārathī*.[*] In proverbs and verses of late origin it is universally assumed that four horses will be used. Thus (vii. 112. 46 ff.): 'Let the *rathakalpakāḥ* according to rule arrange the chariot,' which has five qualities, and four horses; and we are expressly told in the opening description that all the knights had four-horse chariots. But that such was not always the case will be seen below from the account of the poem itself.

I now examine in detail the war-car and the steeds.

The parts of the chariot (*ratha, yāna, syandana* = currus): Beneath is the axle (*akṣa*), to the ends of which the wheels are attached, and above and before which is the charioteer's place, while above and behind is the place of the knight. The 'nest' or box above is so intimately connected with the axle that the two are often broken together.[†] The noiseless running of the axle is especially praised.[‡] The mention of this part of the wagon often implies that the car has only two wheels[§]—as where, in enumerating disasters following single arrows, we find that a knight broke the single yoke with one arrow; the 'three-fold-piece,' with three; the four steeds, with four; and the one axle (the two wheels), with two (iv. 57. 36). In iii. 134. 9 this is formally stated to be the case. The wheel consists, besides the wooden circle, of the tire (*rathanemi*, vi. 117. 54), the spokes (*ara*), and the hub (*nābhi*). The 'place at the spokes' (*arāsthāna*) was reserved for knights, high-born attendants of the king, 'who at the master's chariot did mighty deeds in the van.'[‖] The tire, which was also called 'fore-circle' (*pramaṇḍala*), appears to be of iron, if we may judge from constant reference to the 'noise of the hoofs and the tires.'[¶] But what is the 'chariot-nest'? and does it differ from the 'chariot-lap'? Between these two expressions (*rathanīḍa*, *rathopastha*) I think we may discern a distinction. The *upastha* was the general bottom of the car; the *nīḍa* was the little shelf in front where the charioteer stood. This difference existed probably in four-horse chariots only.*

---

[*] Compare P. W., s. v., and *pārṣṇiyantāraḥ*; vii. 196. 12.

[†] *bhagnacakrākṣanīḍāḥ*, vi. 71. 32: though of course the nest may be broken alone, *bhagnanīḍaḥ*, vii. 113. 13; ib. 196. 13 (v. l. *ati spārha*).

[‡] *akūjanākṣaḥ* (*rathaḥ*) v. 48. 28 (Pāṇini uses *kūjana* of wheels).

[§] Two-wheeled chariots are implied also as the regular form in the Sūtra period: compare e. g. Āçv. G. S. iii. 12. 1 ff.; Pār. G. S. iii. 14. 2.

[‖] vii. 34. 14; xii. 98. 28: *bhartū rathe ca yaḥ çūro vikramed vāhinīmukhe.*

[¶] e. g. ix. 9. 14–15. It was only the axle that should run without noise, i. e. without creaking. The car as a whole is famous for its racket; compare 'the earth-shaking rush' of a car in vii. 188. 1. The minutiæ in the carpentry of the car I have not particularly observed, but doubt if more special points can be solved by the Epic. The points discussed are those most important or doubtful. The car-wheel described in

---

Çvet. Up. i. 4 has three tires, fifty spokes, twenty *pratyara* or counter-spokes, and sixteen end-pieces to the felly (or felly and tire together), as if these were made of small pieces patched together. I do not understand the *ṣodaçānta* or the 'forty-eight' pieces following. Very likely this may be nothing but an imagined wheel, to illustrate the philosophical stuff in which it is buried.

* Compare the following examples: the *rathanīḍa* is for the charioteer alone in viii. 24. 38; 64. 28; vi. 53. 5 = ib. 114. 33; vii. 173. 5. The last example is copied from the two identical passages in the sixth book: *sārathiṁ cā 'sya* (*çūrasya*) *bhallena rathanīḍād apātayat*, 'with one dart he made the charioteer fall from the nest.' Compare also the cutting of the *yugaṁdhara* from the nest in vii. 16. 31. But when the knight falls, he 'sinks down in the lap of the chariot,' as does Droṇa (vii. 162. 42, *niṣasāda rathopasthe:* compare viii. 15. 42; 50. 47) And so it is said of a knight hard pressed, 'he wavered not from the lap of the car' (vi. 54. 17). 'Down in the lap of the car' sinks the king, and faints there (*kaçmalaṁ ca jagāma*); while the charioteer turns the steeds and retreats (vi. 58. 17). The scene comes again (in viii. 15. 43), where the driver, seeing his master senseless in the *upastha*, withdraws from the contest in the sight of all the army, and takes the king with him (although usually on such an occasion there is a rush to seize the wounded knight, as in viii. 62. 31–32, where the king crouches down in the *upastha* and all cry 'seize the king'). So again in vi. 92. 36 the knight sinks in the *upastha*. So in R. vi. 51. 79 the knight is in the *upastha;* or the banner falls into it, R. vi. 86. 37. But in the last Epic case the distinction shows itself to be not a total one, but one of part and whole; for here the two drivers (*yantārāu*) are also wounded and fall in the 'lap,' and again a charioteer (*sūta*) falls from the 'lap' in v. 182. 3; the *sārathi* is in the *upastha* in iv. 33. 40; the *upastha* includes the *nīḍa* in iii. 21. 25–26. As, however, the drivers generally are represented in the 'nest,' and we know them to be in front (*syandanāgryeṇa* is even the position of Mātali, iii. 171. 28), and the knights are in the 'lap,' we may assume that in the narrower sense *upastha* denotes the owner's place, and *nīḍa* the driver's, although the 'lap' or 'bottom' may be taken to denote the whole of the underpart. The little roofed fore-chamber of the Assyrian war-car, as distinguished from the plain front of the Persian, would be perhaps too much to assume for the Hindu car; but a chamber, if unroofed, separated from the knight's room, seems necessary. Compare besides the above the following: a joyful knight 'as it were danced in the *upastha*' (vi. 100. 46; 104. 29). A fainting knight sits in the *upastha*, braced against the flagpole (vi. 101. 47–48). Bhīma's son is killed, and the body lies in the *upastha*, while the driver drives away with it (vii. 166. 38). Of Karṇa, when slain by Arjuna, the same words are used (*upāviçad rathopasthe*, viii. 53. 36). But when Çalya demands that his equality with Karṇa be recognized, he refuses to take the place of the ordinary charioteer, and so we find him in the *upastha*, whence he manages the reins (*çalyo rathopasthe raçmisaṁcārakovidaḥ*, viii. 79. 11: compare ib. 36. 10, *samīpastham mā 'roha tvam*, to Çalya). Again a knight leaps to the ground from the *upastha*, and fights with his club (ix. 11. 41). All the knights of the army are described as standing before the battle begins either 'in the lap of a war-car or on the shoulder

The chariot, as the preceding quotations show, swung so low that it was easy to leap out or in, or to force another out. We even read in a very vigorous rush of 'all the knights deprived of their cars': that is, flung out (vi. 48. 25). One knight leaps out to seize hold of one below (vi. 59. 100). Often the car is mounted, apparently in motion, by refuge-seeking friends, who climb up after losing their own cars. We thus find two brothers standing in one chariot after one of them had deserted his own because of slain horses.*

The chariot gives the honorable title of *rathin* and *atirathin* to the knight. According to the opening of the war, the knights are classified as 'those that have chariots,' 'superior chariot-men,' 'very superior chariot-men,' etc.†

---

of an elephant (v. 165. 20). The word *apātayat*, usually used as above, is often simply of the war-car as a whole (*rathād bhūmāv apātayat*, vii. 169. 14), so that we cannot tell what part is intended. We may, I think, also draw from these quotations the conclusion that the knight seldom had, or used, a seat, but generally stood in the *upastha*, probably the round hollow bottom, implied by *uḍupa* (e. g. xvi. 5. 8), car as boat, which contained breastplates of leather and metal, bows, arrows, etc., probably stored about the side (viii. 79. 5). That the driver has a seat is indicated by the term *bandhura* or *atibandhura* (e. g. vii. 36. 31; iii. 241. 31), handed down from the Vedic age, here as the seat of the driver, while (if one exists) the knight's seat is called *talpa*, vii. 192. 68. 'Bosom' (*kroḍa*) rather than 'lap' is the commentator's definition of *upastha* (vii. 36. 32). It itself makes a comfortable seat to repose in after one has unharnessed and seen to the horses, and wants to rest in the stable (iii. 73. 32). The commentator is certainly wrong in taking *upastha* to mean *uparibhāga* in iv. 45. 7. The *upastha* as storage-place in R. ii. 39. 20.

* vi. 78. 22; scene repeated in vii. 30. 7. The expression for dismounting or tumbling out of a car is *avatīrya rathāt*, *rathād avaplutya*, *plutaḥ syandanāt:* vii. 3. 8; viii. 90. 105; vi. 59. 89; 86. 35; vii. 31. 24. One descends from the front apparently in R. vi. 111. 55 (*avatīrya vimānāgrāt:* unless the *agra* be a pointed rear, which seems impossible). In xii. 38. 13, *rathāt paçcād avātarat*, the adverb is temporal. The ordinary mount appears to be from the side or back. Climbing into another's car is illustrated by vi. 48. 95 ff. (cf. 79 ff.): 78. 22; 82. 20 (father and son); 113. 18 ('with bow destroyed, deprived of war-car, his horses slain, his driver slain, he hastily mounted the car of Citrasena'); vii. 30. 7. In vi. 58. 9 ff., the two stand and shoot together at the foe after Sātyaki ascends Abhimanyu's car. Arjuna even seizes his son in his arms and lifts him into the car. The words employed are about the same, but not technicalities of driving, apparently. *Āruroha*, *adhiruroha*, *abhi-āsthāya*, *upāruh*, *pratyapadyanta*, are all used for mounting; *avaruh*, *pratyavaruh*, *avaplutya* for dismounting (*yānad avaplutya*, viii. 61. 44; *avaruhya yānād*, 84. 24). *Avaplutya* has also the technical sense in fighting of retiring: thus, a knight, knowing his sword is broken, retires six paces (*avaplutya padāni ṣaṭ*, vii. 14. 74), but *āplutya* (eight paces, vii. 15. 28) is 'advancing.'

† These terms were also employed as proper names. Adhiratha, Ādhirathi, Atiratha (vii. 134. 13, 11; viii. 51. 68; vii. 132. 6; 133. 44), were at first those skilled in driving 'on the car.' Proper names are also made by forming *ratha* into the end of a compound, as Vṛkaratha (*nāma bhrātā karṇasya*), vii, 157. 21. Compare also p. 148; note.

The ease with which the chariot is overturned indicates again its small size, for it falls over 'like a clod' when the driver's hand is loosed (vi. 48. 18); and its fragility is shown by the ease with which it is splintered (*çakalīkṛta*) and the knight decarred (*virathīkṛta*); while another indication of size may be gleaned perhaps from the poetical statement that 'the wheels sank up to the hubs in blood.'*

The knight sometimes falls forward directly over the front of the chariot,† which would imply absence of railing or defense before the knight. There appears, however, to have been a guard of some sort round the car in the Vedic period; and in the Epic we may probably translate the 'guard' (*varūtha*) in this way, though it also means an over-shield. The usual application of this word as an adjective of the car leaves the sense doubtful;‡ though, being spoken of as distinct from the sun-screen, the former meaning seems certainly admissible, as well as indicated by the cars 'void of defense,' where the sun-screens do not appear to be meant. The commentator says it is a leather protector.§ There is nothing, however, but this *varūtha* to correspond to the *ἄντυξ*, made probable for the earlier time; and flying weapons never appear to be impeded or caught from above by the 'protector,' nor is it a conspicuous target (as the flag and pole are), though included in damaged portions of a wrecked car.‖ It must, nevertheless, have been low, if it ran in front at all; for, besides falling over in front, a man falls and clings for a long time to the pole, till he becomes insensible, as if still partly in the car (iv. 64. 48, 49).

The 'pole of the car' (*ratha-īṣā*), or commonly the pole alone (*kūbara*),¶ is fastened to the box of the car (*kāṣṭha*), and to the double yoke (*yuga*, *iugum*, *ζυγόν*) that crosses it, and (*dhur*) rests in turn on the necks of the steeds.** The fastenings of the yoke (like the general *cakrabandha*, *rathabandha*) are termed *yoktra*, fastening yoke and pole, or *saṁnahana*, 'joiners,' and all appear to be of leather, as do the reins (*raçma-*

---

* *ānābhi*, vii. 146. 89; 103. 30–31; vi. 117. 15.

† *hato rathāgrād apatat*, viii. 89. 65; *rathānīku*, vii. 96. 70, is a rank.

‡ *savarūthāḥ*, vi. 106. 22; *mahārathāḥ savarūthāḥ*, ix. 26. 37.

§ *vivarūtha*, viii. 16. 14; with *chattra* and *bandhura*, iii. 241. 31.

‖ 'The yoke, pole, *varūtha*, standard, charioteer, horses, threefold-piece, and the seat' (*talpa*, not turret), iii. 242. 5.

¶ vi. 46. 5; 71. 39; vii. 196. 12, etc. Perhaps also *yugaṁdhara*, 'yoke-holder,' vi. 1956 C = 48. 94 B, *yugabandhura*; and vii. 16. 31.

** *dhur* means the load, either pole or half-yoke; *dhuryam* is merely the weight on the horse coming from the piece in the neck; *dhuryam* may, therefore, include part of the pole itself. The duplicity of this yoke consists in two pieces, one about the neck of each horse, so that, when it is cut in two, each horse carries one *dhur*: compare vi. 48. 24–25, *cakre bhagne yuge chinne ekadhurye haye hataḥ, ākṣiptaḥ syandanād vīraḥ sasārathir ajihmagāiḥ*.

*yaḥ*),[*] and are gilded, so that they 'shine like the sun,' with the gaudy rest.[†] When a distinction is intended, *īṣā* is the lower, *kūbara* the upper end of the pole.[‡]

A desperate attempt against the Kuru commander of the day by a knight no longer able to use his bow shows us the use to which the stout pole of the car may be put (vii. 191. 21 ff.). The knight's charioteer has been slain; he thereupon directs his horses full at the steeds of his opponent, in such a way that the horses of both cars 'become mixed together' (*asyā 'çvān svarathāçvāiḥ . . vyāmiçrayat*, 19); he then drew sword, and, taking his shield, crawled down upon the pole of his own war-car, and 'standing on the middle of the yoke, on the very tip of the yoke, and on the hind-quarters of the blood-red horses' (of his foe), suddenly appeared under the front of his adversary's car, who meanwhile saw no opportunity (*antaram*) of killing him. The Mahāratha (or distinguished knight) whom he attacked then seized a car-spear (*rathaçakti*) and slew the foe's horses; 'avoiding his own red steeds,' but letting them escape with broken harness. The adventurer is cast to the ground, and for the moment defeated, but the whole army 'honored his great achievement.'[§] Here apparently the knight uses the car-shield to protect himself with.[‖]

The relative positions of the four horses drawing a large chariot were as follows: one bears the right-hand *dhur*, one the left, the 'near' horse; one is attached to the end of the fore-axle (*pārṣṇi*) on the left; another, parallel to this, to the axle-end on the right. Such seems to be the arrangement according to the text, though it would not be impossible to interpret as a double span, the foremost drawing on the yoke and pole, the hinder pair on the axle. N. understands two yokes.[¶]

The car-pole (*rathadhur*), held at one end by the yoke, was either regarded as divided at the heavy end into three parts, two of these (the pole the third) being side braces that ran behind the horses and connected at each end with the *kāṣṭha*, axle-wood (box), and this was called the 'threefold-piece' (*triveṇu*), literally 'the piece with three sticks;' or this piece was a triangle of bamboo, one side of which was parallel to the axle and the other two ran together to the pole.*

---

[*] The reins and girdles are distinct, viii. 27. 30.

[†] vii. 2. 34; 115. 20; viii. 79. 59.

[‡] Thus the *triveṇu* is *īṣā*, the *yugaṁdhara* is *kūbara* (see below).

[§] Dhrishtadyumna's progress: *tataḥ sa rathanīḍasthaṁ svarathasya ratheṣayā, agacchad asim udyamya çatacandraṁ ca bhānumat*, then stepped upon the *yugamadhya*, then stood *jaghanārdheṣu cā 'çvānām*, directly under the foe's *nīḍa*, 27 ff., and also *yugapālīṣu*.

[‖] Depriving a car of its pole was one of the manœuvres practiced; the car was then *vikūbara* or *çīrṇakūbara*, vii. 196. 12, etc. The trick of seizing the pole is not uncommon. When Bhīma sees the Guru coming through an opening in the array (*vyūhadvāra*), 'he gets out of his own car in a hurry, and shoots at the *atiratha*, seizing the pole of his war-car' (vii. 128. 20: compare R. vi. 69. 46, *nihatya hayān nirmathye 'ṣāṁ rathasya*, etc.

[¶] Compare iv. 45. 20 ff.: *dakṣiṇāṁ yo dhuraṁ yuktaḥ (hayaḥ); yo 'yaṁ dhuram dhury avaro vāmāṁ vahati; yo 'yam pārṣṇiṁ vahati; yo 'yaṁ vahati me pārṣṇiṁ dakṣiṇām abhitaḥ sthitaḥ.*

The chariot, when entering the field, always carries a loose piece of wood, which often comes off and lies with flags, standards, etc. This is the 'drag' (*anukarṣa*), explained variously,† but most simply as 'a piece of additional wood fastened beneath the car for the purpose of quickly repairing damages sustained in battle.' It would thus be a part of the *upaskara* or general furnishings of the war-car. As I have noted no occasion where any attempt was made to repair a damaged car in the field, it may be that it was meant for the artizans left in camp, who could use the timber at night, and always find some when needed. To drag about a log of wood for the sake of possible repairs at night seems, however, so absurd that I am almost led to think the piece was meant as ballast: not unlikely when we remember how the cars tip over every few minutes.[*] From such hints and guesses we may perhaps conclude that at least the two-wheeler was a very light affair, constructed largely of bamboo (though light, a very tough wood: compare its use for bows), and meant mainly for speed and manœuvring. *Ghūrṇa* or shaking, as applied to a war-car, is indicative of this.[†] It is generally assumed that war-cars of the earliest period were heavy and clumsy; but on the contrary the earliest form seems to have been very small and light; with the addition of another wheel and ultimately pair of wheels come size, stability, weight. The *currus* of the Roman and *syandana* of the Hindu are both so named from their 'running' power or speed.[‡]

---

* The two side-pieces seem quite certain. I cannot decide whether the third piece was an addition to the axle parallel to it or was the pole itself continued. Compare the commentator on *chinnatriveṇucakrākṣaḥ*, viii. 16. 13: *ubhayataḥ kāṣṭhadvayasahito dhūrdaṇḍaḥ*, 'the yoke-pole connected on both sides with the two ends of the axle-box.' This piece of wood is generally mentioned without description in the text. Where Arjuna mounts his car in iii. 175. 4 (*girikūbarapādākṣaṁ çubhaveṇutriveṇumat*), the commentator says that the *pādāu* are the (two) wheels, and defines our word as a 'three-cornered piece of wood uniting pole and axle, and called *çubhaveṇu*, because the sticks (*veṇavaḥ*) of which the *triveṇu* was made were beautiful.' That is to say, the wood was bamboo, but the compound had so often been used that the same word could be used again as an adjective. The word occurs quite often (compare iii. 242. 5; iv. 57. 37; vii. 156. 83 ff., *triveṇuka*, etc.). We find it silvered (*rajatatriveṇu*), viii. 37. 27; and apparently synonymous with *tridaṇḍa* (*īṣā tadubhayapārçvadāruṇī*, comm.): from which we may also conclude that the original bamboo had been replaced by stronger wood, though keeping the old name. Such use of the word as this, and that in ix. 9. 31, *nadī triveṇudaṇḍakā vṛtā*, easily leads to a confusion with the flag-staff, which may also be of three bamboo pieces. The Puranic use is a copy of the Epic, as in Var. P. 96. 11, *rathāḥ sucakradaṇḍākṣatriveṇuyuktāḥ*, etc. Chariots described as *dvitriveṇavaḥ*, in the description of vii. 36. 31 ff., would seem to support Burnouf's notion that the *triveṇu* was anyway the flag-staff. But the commentator always keeps the explanation given above; and it seems more likely that what is meant is a double triangle, one on top of the other, for strength; although 'two or three' might be the interpretation, not referring to flag-staffs, but to this pole-piece as compound of three or of only two, the essential parts. The meaning in the last passage, however, remains to me quite doubtful. It is just possible that the *triveṇu* modified the shape of the war-car, and that we have to translate *rathāgra* in many passages more literally (*hato rathāgrād apatat*, viii. 89. 65, etc.).

† v. 155. 3: vi. 89. 38; 106. 21 ff.; vii. 38. 6, with *talpa* and *triveṇu*; viii. 19. 42; 58. 26; and often.

The standards and flags of the war-cars, *dhvaja, ketu, patākā*:[§] These bear an important part in battle, for they are the rallying points of either party, and the standard of a great knight is well spoken of as the upholder of his whole army. They are not, however, national, but individual. They do not correspond morally to our flag, but rather to the plume of the European knight in the middle ages. This distinction must be borne in mind, for it illustrates at a glance the Hindu field, where, as said above, the men fight only for their leaders.

We have next to distinguish between ensign and banner. At the back of the car, perhaps on one side, rises a staff, straight up high from the floor. The main staff, I incline to think, was in the back-middle of the car, while the little flags were on the side. This staff bore the ensign or signum at its top, and apparently below this top floated the flag.[‖] The flag-pole was often the first objective point of the foe's arrows, which seem aimed not so much at the symbol as at the pole itself, doubtless because the former was of metal and the latter of bamboo;[¶] though of course the ultimate purpose was to disgrace the knight by bringing down his symbol. When the symbol falls, the whole party (we may rightly regard the knight's followers as such) falls into dismay and disorder. On the top of the staff was placed the *dhvaja* or *ketu*, the former meaning sometimes the whole arrangement, staff and image or banner; the latter the symbol or banner alone. This image was a likeness of some animal, as a boar or flamingo. Thus the *vānara* or ape-ensign of Arjuna was placed on the top of the *dhvaja*, and his car is usually termed the 'car with ape-standard.'* The *ketu* is often a part of the *dhvaja*, but as often synonymous with it (in its narrower sense). Thus any symbol as specification of the general *dhvaja* may be so used also of the *ketu*.† The sudden fall of a knight 'like a *dhvaja* released from its fastening' implies a heavy substance; while the expanding (*utsṛjya*) of the *ketu* implies a banner, iv. 65. 1. *Ketu* is, therefore, at times synonymous with *patākā*, 'flag,' while *dhvaja* is also the metal top-piece of the staff, or that with the staff.‡ The height of the standard as a pole may be known by its being always very conspicuous, and inferred again from the pretty image describing a cluster of tall river-trees raised above the flat ground like a *dhvaja* above a war-car (i. 70. 17). The same passage includes a frequent epithet of the army used as a noun, *dhvajinī*, the 'bannered' host (i. 70. 32). One of the battle-books gives us what is called 'a picture of the standards,' whence we see how variegated and of what different sorts they were. They are all 'like mountain peaks,' bright with color and gilded, decorated with flags, and differing in name, form, and color. Arjuna carried 'an ape with ferocious mouth and a lion's tail,' and had flags besides; Karṇa had a *hastikakṣyā;* Drona, a steer; still others bore peacocks, boars, elephants, sometimes bearing bells of silver or of gold; and one knight has a silver boar in a gold net.§ In another place we are told that a younger knight has a gold *çarabha* (an eight-legged monstrosity) as his symbol; and his twin brother, a silver swan with bells.[*] From other passages we see that trees and flowers as well as animals were employed as signs. Especially the palm, which from its height and majesty was regarded as a most fitting emblem for the Kurus' greatest warrior, and was on that account the 'symbol-tree' κατ' ἐξοχήν.[†] The same knight does not, however, bear always the same ensign. Thus, in another war we find Bhīshma with the ensign of five yellow stars and a blue (silk) flag; and Droṇa boasting the *kamaṇḍalu*, or pot, that marked his low origin. Contrasted colors are loved. Kripa has 'red horses and a blue flag,' etc. But the ensigns are individual enough for their knights to be recognized by them, as by their clothes and steeds.[‡] 'With ensigns hoisted,' the knights show themselves ready to advance against the foe.[§] The symbol was a sign giving luck, as notably that of Arjuna, or bore ill luck to its owner.[‖] The color of the metal in the image, or of the cloth in the flag, is always made prominent. One hero has a red ensign,[¶] and others have blue, yellow, etc. But above all white is beloved. So the war-cars 'look like cities,' being so gaily dressed.[**] Karṇa is distinguished by a symbol called *kakṣā*, or *kakṣyā:* I think, a tiger. He is described as having a white flag, crane-colored steeds, a gilded bow, and (after other things) a *nāgakakṣa* or *hastikakṣa*, possibly an elephant girdle, but, from its use in connection with Karna, more likely a beast. Compare viii. 11.7; 56. 85; 87. 7, 90 ff.

---

[*] Possibly the 'block' of wood (*pātalya*) in R. V. iii. 53. 17 may be an *anukarṣa*. Unexplained by Zimmer, loc. cit., p. 251.

[†] So *ghūrṇitavān rathaḥ*, in viii. 90. 83, of the car repeatedly swaying from side to side, though not in war, but through a curse (*ghūrṇe rathe* in 84).

[‡] The names are synonymous. Compare R. i. 71. 5, where the *dvijas* are to go in a *syandana*, and ii. 4. 4, in a *ratha*.

[§] *vāijayantī*, perhaps garland, viii. 58. 28 (see below).

[‖] Compare for the position of the staff the statement in vi. 101. 47–48, where a wounded knight sits down in the *upastha* reclining against the flag-pole (*dhvajayaṣṭiṁ samāçritaḥ*), and the same in vii. 166. 32. The pole could not have been forward, for he would then have turned his back to the foe (since he evidently uses the staff as a brace to his back), a thing no knight, even dying, would do. The only passages that I have noticed which seem to contradict this are like that in vi. 82. 59, where one shot fells *dhvaja* and charioteer; but we cannot deduce much from the remarkable shooting of the Epic heroes.

[¶] *vāiṇavī yaṣṭiḥ*, i. 63. 17: compare *veṇu* in Çat, Dr.

---

* *dhvajāgre*, viii. 79. 22; *vānaradhvajaḥ*, viii. 56. 91, etc.

† Compare *vṛṣabhadhvajaḥ*, *kapidhvajaḥ*, *pakṣivaradhvajaḥ*, iii. 39. 83; viii. 56. 91; 94. 58, etc.; but all used also with *ketu:* but not *ketuyaṣṭiḥ*.

‡ Compare the last line in the first act of Çakuntalā, where the *ketu* has a silk flag (*cīnāṅçukam iva ketoḥ prativātaṁ nīyamānasya*); and the chowrie-flags (*cāmara*) in the similar line of the first act of Vikramorvaçī.

§ The *dhvajā bahuvidhākārāḥ* in the *dhvajavarṇana* of vii. 105. 1 ff. Arjuna has one *siṅhalāṅgūlam ugrāsyaṁ vānaralakṣaṇam*, ib. 8; the distinction of *nāma*, *rūpa*, *varṇa*, ib. 2–5 (*anekavarṇāḥ*). The flag is here *patākā*. From vs. 14 it is evident that the pole in Karṇa's car runs down into the *upastha*. The *govṛṣa* is Çiva's sign (*vṛṣadhvajaḥ*); the boar, Vishnu's. The symbols top the *dhvaja*, but the latter is here also convertible with *ketu*.

The expression *patākin*, 'flagged,' is used as well of the standard, *dhvaja*, as of the car itself, whence we must imagine that the staff bore flags beneath the emblem.[††]

All have these banners (vii. 34. 16), and it is very likely that they were placed on other parts of the car, besides the staff.[‡‡]

---

[*] vii. 23. 86 ff. Abhimanyu's is *çārṅgapakṣī*, bearing a hawk's wing(?). Yudhishthira here has a divine bow. Other such ensigns are found in vi. 74. 13 (*yūpaketuḥ*); vi. 104. 14 (*tāladhvajaḥ*); vii. 2. 23 ff. (*indīvarāṅkaḥ* and *siṅhaketuḥ*); vi. 115. 31 (*karṇikāradhvajaḥ:* compare vii. 36. 12; vi. 112. 29; 115. 26, etc.).

[†] The *tāla* is *dhvajadrumaḥ*, xii. 55. 18. Bhīshma is 'the one with palm as ensign,' *tālaketuḥ, tāladhvajaḥ*.

[‡] Droṇa bears the *kamaṇḍalu* in iv. 55. 43; vii. 23. 82; and a *vedī* of gold in ib. 58. 3. Bhīshma is described in ib. 55. 54 as equipped with *pañcatāreṇa ketunā nīlānusāreṇa;* so Kripa has a *nīlā patākā* in ib. 41. A further mention of the *dhvaja*-animals before the war, in i. 225. 16 (*bhūtāni vividhāni mahānti ca*). On the recognition of the dead by their banners, etc., see xv. 32. 14.

[§] Compare vii. 36. 12; and vi. 45. 7, *abhyavartanta sarva evo cchritadhvajāḥ*. So *ucchritā rathe dhvajayaṣṭiḥ*, x. 13. 4, the technical word.

[‖] *amaṅgalyadhvajaḥ*, vi. 112. 19.

[¶] *lohitakadhvajaḥ*, v. 171. 14; vii. 23. 18.

[**] *rathā nagarasaṁkāçāḥ*, vi. 79. 57. Compare xii. 100. 8.

[††] vii. 193. 12, *dhvajā bahupatākinaḥ*, and often in references given above.

[‡‡] Compare later the explanation of the relation in size between *dhvaja* and *patākā*, Ag. P. 61. 35 (the whole chapter on consecration of *dhvaja* at the door of the king); and Bṛh. Saṁh. 43. 8 39; Mbh. i. 63

A chariot that is *abhipatākin* is one of which the flags, to show victory, blow forward, against the wind.* Karṇa's flag is golden and garlanded,† and the bow of Indra (rainbow) alone can serve to describe all the colors of the flags.‡ So we read of the flags and umbrellas shining in an array among jewels and weapons.§ Before and in the war we find Yudhishthira riding on a car of which the flagstaff-top was ornamented with two musical instruments, perhaps tambourines, called *mṛdañgāu* (iii. 270. 6; vii. 23. 85).

The special flags called *vāijayantyaḥ* appear to be used in war only upon the elephants, and must therefore have been of small size (vi. 112. 27; viii. 58. 28). These may be only garlands, as in the 'Indra-garland' (i. 63. 15)—a sign of victory.

*Dhvaja* is used outside of war as any sign, e. g. of a god, or of a huckster. Thus we have *dharmadhvajaḥ* and *dharmadhvajikaḥ* of the sun, 'whose emblem is duty;' or used of one that sins, that trades in duty.‖

Almost as part of the banners stands the *chattra*, or umbrella, a real protector, and indispensable part of a car's furniture, but also regarded as a flaunting ornament. It was generally white. On festal occasions it is carefully held over the head by another equal or attendant. In spite of its frequent occurrence in descriptions of spoils, it does not seem to play any part in the action, and I fancy it does not really come into the poem until a later age, but properly is to be associated with the mass of effeminate luxuries depicted long after the original.¶

The arms stored in the chariot are represented as so many that we can only see late readings in such statements. The car, according to these accounts, was an arsenal, holding a complete assortment of arms in large numbers. Thus, a car (vi. 106. 22 ff.) is full of all arms, and a knight says (vii. 112. 46 ff.): 'Let the car-attendants put all the car-quivers (*upāsaṅgas*), all the furniture (*upakaraṇāni*), just as is right, into my war-car; for I shall use all weapons, and the car must be furnished as has been appointed by instructors.'*

---

* viii. 11. 7 ff. Compare *atipatākaḥ* (*rathaḥ*) in viii. 24. 54; 59. 67, a war-car with banner over it.

† *patākā kañcanī sragvī dhvaje*, vii. 105. 13.

‡ *indrāyudhasavarṇābhiḥ patākābhir alaṁkṛtaḥ*, vi. 50. 44; compare ib. 79. 57, *nānāvarṇavicitrābhiḥ patākābhir alaṁkṛtaḥ*.

§ vi. 87. 14. Compare also viii. 24. 54, 72, cars with banners and moon-colored steeds; elephants 'with different banners of various colors.'

‖ *dharmadhvajaḥ*, iii. 3. 19; *dhvajikaḥ*, xiii. 163. 62 (cf. *dhvajin*).

¶ Thus, in viii. 27. 33, on the battle-field are found umbrellas, fans, sandal wood (the Hindus' most costly wood); and in ix. 10. 2, 'a gleaming white umbrella' is carried over Yudhishthira; cf. iv. 55. 55 and 64. 3. In vi. 22. 6, the chariot-umbrella has ivory ribs. One of the first things Açvatthāman asks, when he finds his king dying and deserted, is 'Where, oh where is thy pure umbrella? and where is thy fan, O ruler of earth?' (ix. 65. 18). The *chattra* is white (vi. 103. 25), and furnished with a gold-stick (*hemadaṇḍa*, vi. 55. 31; R. vi. 36. 113). Another name, *ātapatra*, 'parasol,' means the same; in a march described in xv. 23. 8, the king goes out with a line of war-cars (*rathānīkena*), and has a white *ātapatra* held over him. The bells on the war-car are also noticed in R. vi. 49. 8.

The knight then goes out to meet the 'Kāmbojas, who are conversant with many arms; the Kirāṭas, who are like poison; the Çakas, who are like fire,' etc.; his lion-*dhvaja* decorated with white flags, himself clothed in a brass corselet, his bow pressed to his bosom; 'and he was adorned with *lāja*, perfume, and wreaths, he, praised by girls, and kissed by the king.'

More specific is the account given in the following (viii. 76. 17): 'Six *ayutāni* of arrows, numberless darts, hammers, spears, knives, *bhallas* (also arrows), two thousand *nārācas* (iron arrows), three thousand *pradara* (arrows)—which not even a wagon drawn by six cows could carry' (*çakaṭaṁ ṣaḍgavīyam*)—are here left under the care of one warrior. 'With darts (54. 7, *viçikha*, *vipāṭha*; 29, *pṛṣatka*) and handguards, with quiver and horn and banner, with breast-plates, diadem, sword, and bow,' is the description of a knight in his car (iv. 53. 9). In another passage (xiv. 79. 14), a knight 'ascended the car packed with hundreds of quivers, after he had girded on his golden breast-plate and his shining helm.' A hundred quivers, besides clubs, *çataghnīs*, bells, spears, spits, darts, bows, are in a car with a *varūtha* (viii. 11. 8). A car of priceless value is described in the (late) twelfth book, but is used for state, not for war, and appears to be merely a means of exhibiting jewels, being adorned with sapphires (*masāra*), crystal, and gold-plated wheels (*hemanibaddhacakraḥ*), while 'all sorts of gems' are fastened to it, so that it 'shines like the newly risen sun.'† Compare the brief account, marked late by the meter, in the opening war-scene, where Yudhishthira has 'a war-car like Indra's, with golden harness, and bright with *hāṭaka* (gold);'‡ and also compare the car described again in the twelfth book (37. 32 ff.), where the king 'mounts a nice new war-car covered with *kambala*-skins, and drawn by sixteen white cows.' In this car Bhīma, the emperor's brother, 'took the reins' (*jagrāha raçmīn*), as it was at a great state ceremony, and Arjuna held the white umbrella (*pāṇḍuraṁ chattram*) of royalty over the emperor's head. In the same passage we find mentioned a car drawn by men: that is, the steeds were replaced by men (*narayāna*, ib. 40). Another description of one of these enormous war-carriages is furnished by a passage contemporaneous with or next later than the last. It is here we find a distinction (above, p. 236) formally made between war-cars and pleasure-cars;* and here perhaps the shortest yet fullest picture of the former in its greatest if not most ponderous glory. 'Harness up (*sajjīkuru ratham*), the saint cried; prepare quickly thy chariot called the war-car, with weapons and banners, with a spear and a gold staff (*yaṣṭi*), noisy with the sound of bells, furnished with ornamental doors (*yuktas toraṇakalpanāiḥ*, 31), gilded, supplied with hundreds of arrows; this was done, and the king placed his wife at the left of the pole (*vāme dhuri*), himself at the right, and laid within the car the goad, sharp-pointed, made of three sticks' (*tridaṇḍaṁ vajraçūcyagram pratodaṁ tatra cā 'dadhat*)—for this was another *narayāna*, and the king and his wife were forced to drag the car for a great saint. Whether we may be allowed to predicate but two steeds for such a car in its normal locomotion I doubt, but these two were goaded 'on back and hip,' and dragged the saint about for some time without exhaustion. The ornamented doors were probably in relief, judging by a Purāṇa standard; though Epic evidence fails me.†

---

* His car is *pañcaguṇa*, 'has the five qualities,' unexplained.

† xii. 46. 33 ff. A hundred villages are put parallel to a hundred war-cars in viii. 38. 9; if for comparative value, such state-cars must be meant.

‡ vi. 22. 5; a designation of gold more common in R.

Another description, rather simpler, tells us that the war-car ready for battle was 'large and fine, and adorned with bells, with a golden net, and light to run with the noise of thunder; well-adorned, furnished with tiger-skins which made protection (guard, *varūthin*), and drawn by good fair-necked steeds' (v. 131. 28 ff.). Compare the almost identical description of a war-car in the sixth book of the Rāmāyaṇa: 'He mounted with joy the divine war-car, his bow strung, that car furnished with all kinds of weapons, sounding with a hundred bells, harnessed with thought-swift steeds, and well guided by the charioteer; which had the sound of thunder, and the glory of the shining moon or sun; which had a lofty flag-staff; which was irresistible, furnished with a protection (*suvarūtham*), well adorned, covered with a net of gold, on fire as it were with glory.'*

---

* *sāṁgrāmiko rathaḥ* and *krīḍārathaḥ*, xiii. 53. 28 ff.

† See P.W., *kalpana*. Compare the *vimāna* described in R. vi. 106. 22 ff. It is adorned with gold and gems, banners, and emblems; and it is beautified by *hemakakṣyāḥ* (m.), gold plates, and nets of bells. The Lexicon compares *kakṣa*, defined as part of the car (*kakṣa*, 12) by native lexicographers, and translates doubtfully 'Flügel.' Apropos of the legend, it may be asked why, if any weight at all is laid on a legend describing how a king maltreated the priests (see above, p. 73), we should not also conversely treat this story as an indication of the way priests treated kings. The answer is: because the former is a national legend, and belongs to respectable tradition; the king so proud being held up by the Epic and legal literature alike, his image being in a sense historical; while this latter is one of the wild self-made absurdities of the pseudo-Epic, not supported by earlier legend; and because the former illustrates what may well have happened at an earlier day, and the latter fails to correspond to any antecedent probability.

Some parts of the chariot are not easily explained, as they are rarely mentioned, and not described. Thus, we find in a list of parts of chariots, besides those already discussed, the *daṇḍaka*, apparently equivalent to *yaṣṭi*, the banner-staff; the *jaṅghā*, probably the *akṣajaṅghā* or 'axle-tree;' and the *daçana*. perhaps the spokes (unless the harness in general be meant).† The triangle-piece, elsewhere explained, is said in another passage of this book to be silvered; and from the same paragraph we may add a new item to the car, namely the *tri-koça* or threefold receptacle, said to be of gold, i. e. gilded: 'the war-car decked with tiger-skins, of noiseless axle, golden *tri-koça*, and silver triangle-piece.'‡ *Koça* alone is specifically a sheath for a sword. We may have in the last three epithets three near parts, axle, axle-box, axle-pole-triangle, as *koça* is used in Vedic literature; but why three-fold? On account of its non-specific meaning, frequent in the Epic, I prefer to regard it as indication of three compartments for receiving arms.

---

* R. vi. 31. 28 ff. Bells are here *kiṅkiṇī* (*çatanādita*). Compare R. vi. 49. 8. Compare, too, R. vi. 51. 17 ff. (*sadhvajaḥ . . sānukarṣaḥ*) a car furnished with tridents, axes, etc., in ib. 108; and R. vi. 66. 8, where *agnivarṇa* of *ratha* is to be thus interpreted as 'golden.' The same R. vi. 74. 1 (*rathānāṁ cā 'gnivarṇānāṁ sadhvajānāṁ varūthinām*).

† (*rathān*) *īṣāmukhān dvitriveṇūn nyastadaṇḍakabandhurān, vijaṅghākūbarāṅs tatra vinemidaçanān api; vicakropaskaropasthān bhagnopakaraṇān api, prapātitopastaraṇān*, vii. 36. 31 ff. The commentator does not touch the words given above; those not given here are discussed in their place. *Daçana* (see P. W.) for *daṅçana?* Its close connection with the wheel and all parts of the car would seem to refute 'harness' as a proper translation. From its literal meaning one is tempted to bring *daçana* into connection with the 'hook' sense of *aṅkāu* and *nyaṅkāu*, and imagine a tooth or hook on the wheels But scythes or their equivalents seem not to have been used, or they would have played a part in the descriptions; and they can not be proved for either the Vedic or Epic age. Rājendralāla devotes himself to the proof for Vedic times, but the one passage quoted proves nothing. The *aṅkāu* and *nyaṅkāu*, 'which run along with the wind on each side of the war-car,' could easily by themselves be taken thus; they are by implication the protectors of the car, and *abhito ratham* (*yāu dhvāntaṁ vātāram anu saṁcarantāu*) means loosely 'found on each side' (not part of the side), as in Mbh. iv. 64. 33, *ratharakṣiṇaḥ çerate . . abhito ratham*, 'lie on each side of the car,' or as sharp protecting pieces fastened to the side; but this passage from Pār. G. S. iii. 14. 6 is not definite enough at the best to allow of its being used as an argument on the point.

‡ *rathaṁ vāiyāghracarmāṇam* (= *vyāghracarmaparivṛtam*, comm.) *akūjanākṣaṁ hematrikoçaṁ rajatatriveṇum*, viii. 37. 27.

The allegorical car described in viii. 33. 17 ff. gives a few unique particulars in regard to the chariot. We find here a protector called *parivāra*, and one called *parirathyā* (compare A.V. viii. 8. 22), besides the common *varūtha*; a *pariṣkara*, 'guard of the wheels'; two *adhiṣṭhāne*, 'standing places over the fore-wheels' (M.); and an *apaskara*, a hind-piece of wood. The seat, called *bandhura*, is made of three pieces. Knights guarding the car are called *puraḥsarāḥ*, *pariskandāḥ*, and *pṛṣṭharakṣāu* or *cakrarakṣāu*. These are also called *pārçvagopāḥ* and *paripārçvacarāḥ*. Both commentators understand that there are four wheels. The similar cars described in the Purāṇas seem to be copies of those in the Epic.

In the simpler descriptions, and often seen by implication, we find two-wheeled cars. Since the commentator is used to the later order of four-wheelers, he sometimes endeavors to make these into the four-wheelers, as was said above. Nevertheless, from the Epic descriptions we should almost believe that two-wheeled cars were universal, except in the latest portions of our text. For instance, in one case a wheel comes off a car; and then, it is said, 'the horses dragged the car with one wheel.'* By implication, Krishna's car, said to have had 'two wheels, like the sun and the moon,' could have had no more (v. 83. 15). This car has four horses, so that, we see, the four steeds were not confined to the larger chariots (the size of a war-car does not seem to have anything to do with the bestowing of the titles *mahāratha*, *atirutha*, etc.).† Another two-wheeled car is inferable in a passage that says: 'the (one) yoke, the one pole, the two wheels, and the one axle, were broken, cut to pieces by arrows' (v. 181. 14).

On the other hand, eight-wheeled cars are spoken of, although very seldom. The same number of steeds is sometimes found.‡ As we see the car of two horses and two wheels the prevailing one in the earlier period, and can trace a gradual increase in weight and size, we may say with Lucretius:

> Et biiugos prius est quam bis coniungere binos,
> Et quam falciferos armatum escendere currus.§

---

* *ekacakraṁ ratham . . ūhuḥ*, vii. 189. 54.

† v. 165, quoted above, p. 148, with Kripa's extraordinary title *rathayūthapayūthapaḥ*, 166. 20, applicable to numbers or ability only.

‡ 'Great was the noise of the eight-wheeled car,' vii. 175. 13 (*rathaḥ . . aṣṭacakrasamāyuktaḥ*). Again *aṣṭacakra* in vii. 167. 38. These eight-wheelers belong to the book nearest in age of battle-books to the Rāmāyaṇa. So we find also in Rāmāyaṇa the *aṣṭacakrasamāyukto mahārathaḥ* (R. vi. 44. 27). For the steeds, see below.

§ Lucret. v. 1298. His next venture will scarcely obtain credence, certainly not for India: et prius est armatum in equi conscendere costas . . quam biiugo curru belli temptare pericla.

We are now prepared to disbelieve the erroneous statement made at the opening of the war, when describing the battle-cars. The error consists in the universal practice asserted. But probably the following accurately describes the largest chariot used, except the eccentric and unique special cars of one or two heroes. My subjects are in part anticipated by this formal statement, which says (v. 155. 13 ff.): 'All the cars were drawn by four horses (*caturyuj*), and equipped with arrows and spears, and a hundred bows apiece; for each car were two pole-horses, directed by one driver (*dhuryayor hayayor ekaḥ . . rathī*), and two outside horses fastened to the axle-end (*pārṣṇi*), and driven by one driver apiece (*pārṣṇisārathī*). The battle-cars were 'like guarded cities,' and the horses had gilded trappings, *hemabhāṇḍa*. Each car was accompanied by ten or by fifty elephants.*

The charioteer, *sūta*, *sārathi*, *yantar*, *niyantar*, *rathayantārāu*, *pārṣṇiyantar*, *pārṣṇisārathī*, *abhīçugraha* (viii. 32. 19), *rathavāhaka*, *rathin* (abstract, *sārathyam*): The car held one or three charioteers. Two alone seem sometimes implied (e. g. vii. 156. 83 ff.). Often, however, the knight is his own driver. One kingly knight sometimes drives for another, as Krishna for Arjuna and Çalya for Karṇa. But the social position of the charioteer is, as seen from Çalya's indignation in the scene quoted at length above (p. 217), one inferior to the knight's in the war-car. He only served for political purposes. There remained enough of the cattle-driver extraction in Karṇa to warrant this, but the dialogue shows the position of the ordinary charioteer to be properly that of a high servant. Of kings the charioteers were not thought unequal to high station, and princes in distress adopt this mode of life by preference. Thus Nala becomes chief hostler, and passes his time in the stable, *açvaçālā;* and Nakula takes service as a horse-trainer. Sanjaya, however, the old charioteer, shares his old king's hermitage.† Of less than kings, the drivers were apparently of little importance; they generally fall in battle unnamed. Still, the practical position outweighs the theoretical station. We find the charioteer refusing to obey when the knight gives too reckless commands, but yielding when pressed. He is a servant, but a privileged one. Moreover, it was the charioteer's duty to guard his knight; and this may easily have been interpreted to imply keeping him out of death's way. Compare the vivid scene in the seventh book: 'Then he urged on the (one) charioteer: "drive thou the steeds quickly before the face of Drona"; . . . and again he urged on the driver, saying "go, go" (*yāhi, yāhi*); but the driver said, "thou art not skilled enough in fighting." Then cried the knight, "I would indeed fight now, even with the gods! Drive on!" and the charioteer, striking with his goad the three-year-old colts, drove on; but he did not rejoice in his mind.'[*]

---

* The ideal may be studied in brief in R. vi. 86. 2 ff.

† Nala, iii. 67; 71. 11; Nakula, iv. 13; Saṁjaya, xv. 16. 4.

The rule of protecting the knight is formal. 'In battle the knight, if confused, must be guarded by the charioteer'; or, 'ever must the man of the war-car be guarded'; and when the charioteer risks his life in saving his master, he does so because he 'bears in mind the rule.'[†] It will have been noticed that we have in the case above but one driver. Side by side with this we find two more, the *sūta* or charioteer proper being understood, especially noted as the *pārṣṇisārathī*, or twain standing on either side of the car, perhaps over the fore-wheels (see above), who guides the horses running free outside the pole-horses (vii. 48. 29). Perhaps we have, conversely, to understand the two in a large car when but one is mentioned, as in the following; but I see no reason for this except the difficulty of one driver's managing a four-in-hand, which is slight, since there is nothing to disprove the possibility of all four horses being on the pole—though this is against usage. Compare: 'Light-handed he shot (a flood of arrows) at the foe's head, neck, hand, foot, bow, horses (pl.), umbrella, standard, charioteer (*niyantar*), three-fold-piece, seat (*talpa*), wheels, yoke, quiver, back-board, flag, two wheel-guards, and all the belongings of his car; down fell the knight wounded in all his adornments and garments, down upon the earth, like a tree bruised by a great wind.' The completeness of description might here be taken as excluding the outer drivers.[‡]

---

[*] vii. 35. 31 ff.; 36. 1 ff. The expressions used are generally the same. Compare *codayā 'çvān bhṛçam*, vii. 145. 3; *tvaṁ sārathe yāhi javena vāhāih*, viii. 76. 2; *tvarayan hayān*, viii. 26. 18, etc. The pride of the knight in venturing to fight the gods is too common to require further reference. We must remember that the gods meant are the old-fashioned gods, now much reduced in circumstances, and by no means types of divinity. Another common comparison is likening the foe to grasshoppers, to blades of grass (*matvā tṛṇena tāṅs tulyān*, vi. 113. 36, etc.), or to 'one sixteenth' of one's own power (vii. 111. 30, and often).

[‡] *rakṣitavyo rathī nityam*, iii. 18. 9; and ib. 8, *mohitaç ca raṇe çūro rakṣyaḥ sārathinā rathī.* In iv. 64. 49, the *saṁyantar* rescues the knight, *upadeçam anusmṛtya.*

[‡] vii. 38. 5 (*cakram*, also singular). *Niyantar* is usually *yantar*, controller. The *cakragoptārāu* seem to be guards over the wheels, not guardsmen (*cakrarakṣāu*). The knights are their own drivers in vii. 196. 13. The goad *pratoda*, held by the *sārathi*, is constantly falling from his hand: compare R. vi. 57. 24; 31. 40; and note that the goad and reins are both held in the left hand by an expert driver; and if this arm be wounded, he picks up goad and reins (with the other ?), driving on as before. Compare viii. 27. 16 ff.; *sa nirbhidya bhujaṁ savyam . . hemadaṇḍo jagāma dharaṇīm . . viddhasya . . pratodaḥ prāpatad dhastād raçmayaç ca . . pratodaṁ gṛhya so 'nyat tu raçmīn api yathā purā vāhayāmāsa tān açvān . . .*

We find the king of the Pāndus acting the part of a driver beside the regular charioteer.* The art of the driver consisted not alone in driving well and fast, and keeping the car straight, for this indeed was but the foundation of his science. His true art consisted in wheeling and turning, in bringing the car rapidly about, so as to attack the antagonist with such speed from all quarters that the chariot seemed to advance from all sides at once. Reference has been made to this art in the paragraph on the battle-orders. The circumstances in which the knight or his driver exercises his skill are always the same, either to escape surrounding on the part of the foe or to surround. The names of the circles are apparently technical, in as great a degree as technicalities can be predicated of the transparent battle-terms employed. We have seen the 'right' and 'left' circles spoken of: that is, the 'circle,' *maṇḍala*, is the regular term for the evolution, to which we have added either *yamaka*, 'the double wheel,' or 'left' and 'right,' distributively. Either of the latter is, again, called a 'crescent,' *ardhacandra*. The Rāmāyaṇa, in a doubtful passage, uses the words *vīthī* and *sarpagatī* in as if a technical sense, like *maṇḍala*, corresponding to (*yuddha-*)*mārga*, and it may be that in the Mahābhārata also these words have escaped my notice so used; but I can cite no instance of them from the latter work. The effect of 'circling' was produced by 'goading the steeds and hauling on the reins:' directing them, of course, by the latter at the same time.†

---

* *yudhiṣṭhiras tu madreçam abhyadhāvat . . svayaṁ saṁnodayann açvān dantavarṇān*, ix. 16. 47.

† *maṇḍalāni tataç cakre gatapratyāgatāni ca* (vii. 19. 6.), 'circles he made then forward and backward;' *evaṁ uktvā tato . . . hayān saṁcodya, raçmibhis tu samudyamya javenā 'bhyapatat tadā; maṇḍalāni vicitrāṇi yamakānī 'tarāṇi ca, savyāni ca vicitrāṇi dakṣiṇāni ca sarvaçaḥ; pratodenā 'hatāḥ . . . raçmibhiç ca samudyatāḥ, vyacaraṅs te hayottamāḥ* (iii. 19. 7), 'circles of different sorts, double and single, (other) to left and right.' The partial repetition in vii. 122. 66 gives us *mārgajñaḥ* as one who understands such manœuvres (*maṇḍalāni*, etc.; *itarāni ca carantāu yuddhamārgajñāu tatakṣatur ratheṣubhiḥ*, etc.). The same use in club-fight: compare ix. 57. 25 ff.; 58. 22, 23; in the last example, a *gomūtraka* manœuvre of club-fighting diversifies the contest. I should translate 'in an ellipse' instead of a true circle; here *arim sammohayann iva* is added, the ultimate object being to confuse the foe. 'Wheeling left' is *asavyam āvṛtya vājinaḥ*; 'wheeling right' is *pradakṣiṇam upāvṛtya*, in iv. 57. 42; 64. 4; with *ardhacandram āvṛtya*, 'wheeling a half circle,' ib. 59. 10. In the first of these passages, *yamaka* applied to *maṇḍala* is defined by the commentator as 'repressive.' This meaning would not be impossible throughout, and is etymologically permissible. We should then translate (instead of 'double and single') 'those circles meant to narrow the area of the foe's action. and others'—that is, others that give him headway; but I prefer 'double.' The passage in the Rāmāyaṇa (vi. 92. 3) contains *vīthī* in both editions, but the verse appears corrupt in the second pāda. In vs. 6 (*darçayitvā tatas tān tu gatīr bahuvidhā raṇe*) we have the simple

A further trick of the charioteer is that of driving in such a way as to make a particular kind of noise. Perhaps no more than what corresponds to our individual trick of tread is meant, but we find that an unseen charioteer is recognized simply by the noise he makes in driving. This may be merely the grandeur and loudness of the sound, and it is withal in a 'tale of old' that the fact is mentioned;* but as a man used to the track can recognize one locomotive out of a hundred by ear alone, though bell and whistle be not used, I see no reason why in a chariot-age the same fineness of ear should not be possible, even if in one case the individuality lies in the engine and in the other in the engineer's method. Loudness of noise alone is often approvingly alluded to (e. g. R. vi. 79. 11).

I have already spoken of the eagerness with which a decent knight slays his foe's charioteer. The ensign and charioteer are often aimed at first, and these with the horses being laid low, the knight-to-knight combat first begins. Every scene will give examples of this statement, and a few references will suffice.† It was a very mean and cowardly practice, and engaged in without compunction. The driver was absolutely helpless. The opposing knight looked on him as he did on the horses, and shot him to stop the car. No qualms of honor seem to have been felt; yet the driver was the most unprotected man in the field. The 'code' had not touched him. Even as against the opposing knight, thus destitute of horses and driver, the combat was unfair; but this is the regular usage.

An important casual occupation of the trusted charioteer lies in the office of herald or ambassador, nominally under safety, but endangered by a wrathful prince. Deprecating possible wrath, he was supposed to repeat verbal messages, while acting rather as an agent sent to confer.‡ As daily herald to town from camp goes the charioteer of old Dhritarāshtra, and appears as an old friend of the king. So in the Rāmāyana a charioteer, *sārathi*, is sent with a message to the king (ii. 57. 23). Regular news-seekers were the spies, always taken for granted in each camp. The news of Arjuna's vow is carried across by

---

*gati*; in vs. 3, Gorresio reads *maṇḍalāni ca vīthīç ca jihmāḥ sarpagatīs tathā, darçayantāu bahuvidhān sūtasāmarthyajān guṇān*; while B. (adhy. 109 here) has *gatapratyāgatāni ca* in the second pāda. The Rāmāyaṇa has a simile not very flattering to the charioteer: 'this city deprived of thee will be like a *pṛtanā* whose leader (*vīra*) is slain. and where the charioteer alone is left (in the war car),' ii. 51. 5. A simple manœuvre in R. vi. 90. 10 consists in bedusting the foe (*cakrotkṣiptena rajasā rāvaṇaṁ sa vyadhūnayat*).

* Nala recognized by his *rathaniḥsvanaḥ*, iii. 73. 33–34.

† vi. 72. 26 ff.; 77. 70; vii. 134. 13.

‡ Compare Ulūka, in v. 161 (see above, p. 108).

spies to the other camp (vii. 74. 1). The news of defeat is brought the king by messengers called *vārttikāḥ;* not by the *sūta* that had been the daily reporter of events.[*]

We have also to notice that the *sūta* or professional driver was retained in peace as a musician, and seems in this capacity to have been employed as a regular eulogizer in feasts and processions, along with *bandins* and *māgadhas.*[†] Of the number of charioteers employed by a wealthy potentate we can form no estimate. The Epic says that Yudhishthira, when king of Indraprastha, possessed eight hundred *sūtas* with *māgadhas*, perhaps only musicians.[‡]

The *sūta* had not only to drive but to attend to the horses, put them up, take care of them, and, after battle, draw the arrows out of them and doctor them (v. 180. 1).

*The chariot-steeds:* Aelian tells us that the art of managing horses was not common, but a science confined to a special class. The Indian horses, according to his statement, are directed by a bridle, but not hampered by barbed muzzles or curb-bits.[§] This statement is contradicted by Arrian's report, and is in itself of doubtful interpretation, as *χαλινός*[‖] may be the rein with the bit, or the rein alone. The particular emphasis laid on the *ἐπιστήμη ἱππική* is worth our attention, as we shall see it well grounded by Epic proof.

The most popular war-steed is the horse (*açva*, *haya*, *turaga*, *rathavāha*, *vāha*, etc.). Mules were, however, often employed, and seem to be admired especially on account of their great speed.[¶] Camels are used as steeds only in peace; elephants, only when ridden. Horses are ranked as 'pairs' or as single steeds, the yoked two reckoned as an individual.[**] The relative position of the chariot-pair has been spoken of above; two horses seem to have been kept close to the pole by a yoke, and supported by two outsiders; though it is possible that we have in the *caturyuj* a double-yoke, one behind the other.[††]

---

[*] *vārttikāiḥ kathyamānas tu mitrāṇām me parābhavaḥ*, x. 4. 33.

[†] iii. 257. 1, etc.: see below, on music.

[‡] iv. 70. 18. He had also ten thousand elephants, and thirty thousand chariots (ib.).

[§] *ἔχουσι . . τὴν ὑπερῴαν ἀβασάνιστον.*

[‖] *ādhāna*, said to be bit or snaffle in the older days, for which *khalīna* was substituted, means only harness, apparently. On this and on the Puranic bridle, see Indo-Aryans, ii. 335.

[¶] Two best horses are reckoned equal to four best asses in making a bargain: iii. 192. 51.

[**] The chariot-horses were properly so called. Thus, a king who had been hunting returns *çrāntayugaḥ çrāntahayaḥ*, 'with the pairs of horses and single horses tired out,' i. 78. 15.

[††] *rathā sarve caturyujaḥ*, vii. 60. 2. Cars are generally alluded to as *caturyuj* if any magnificence is intended: compare (v. 86. 6) 'I will give him sixteen cars yoked with four horses apiece.'

In case the ordinary arrangement is practiced, two horses are submitted to the yoke (*dhur*), and two run loose, only held by a strap fastened to each end of the fore-axle.[*] The characteristics of horses most extolled are youth, swiftness, and color. We have seen the age of three years mentioned with approbation,[†] and I may add that white horses are especially prized for swiftness, though other colors are conspicuous; some so diversified that one cannot help conjecturing that quaggas or zebras were imported and called horses. 'Swift as thought,' *manojava*, is the standing epithet of good steeds.[‡] As I have given some attention to the art of the charioteer, it is only fair to say that the horses also were so well trained that they heeded every word, and are even claimed to have known enough to spring up before the knight and confuse him without being directed.[§] This is a unique exhibition, however, and professedly a story only, giving us also (three verses before) an instance of the susceptibility of the Hindu horses in their falling upon their knees before their master. But elsewhere, in scenes of grief, as in Homer, we find the horses weeping.[‖] The prompt obedience of the steeds must be taken as true if we believe the wheeling-feats described. They must also fear no noise whatever.[¶]

Besides these characteristics, certain marks are praised, twists of the hair in various parts of the body, especially one on the forehead (*lalāma*). Such marks were probably explained in the *açvasūtra*, aphorisms on horses, which are mentioned with others on cars and elephants (ii. 5. 120). A full description of desirable steeds says: 'the best horses, lean, powerful, patient of the road, with fire and force, of good breed and manner, with wide nostrils and large jaws';[**] but the following list of 'markings' is probably interpolated.[††] The most famous horses come from the Sindh country or from Kamboja; of the people of the latter country the pseudo-Epic speaks as among the finest horsemen. 'Western horses' in general are highly prized, but those of Sindhu and Kamboja are most mentioned. The latter are called 'speckled,' an epithet often applied, however, to any horse.[*] Sāindhava alone means a horse, as well as a man of Sindh.

---

[*] *pārṣṇivāhāu*, x. 13. 3. See above, p. 181

[†] Abhimanyu's colts, *hayāḥ . . . trihāyaṇāḥ* vii. 36. 9. They are decked with gold ornaments (ib.).

[‡] Horses do not appear to be shod, but constant notice is taken of the 'terrible noise of their hoofs:' as, for example, in vi. 105. 13, *khuraçabdaç ca sumahān*.

[§] iii. 71. 23, *te hayottamāḥ samutpetur athā'kāçaṁ rathinam mohayann iva:* the singular participle for the plural, probably because confused with the proper common use, where *mohayann iva* refers to the knight, as in ix. 58. 23 (compare P. W. s. v. *rathatūr*).

[‖] vii. 192. 20, *hayāç cā 'çrūṇy avāsṛjan;* also R. vi. 57. 25.

[¶] They must be 'patient to each sound,' *sarvaçabdakṣamāḥ*, or *turaṁgamān chaṅkhavarṇān sarvaçabdātigān raṇe*, vii. 162. 3. 'Patient of the arrows' is another laudatory epithet (*vinītaçalyāḥ turagāḥ*), vii. 112. 56.

[**] Virāhamihira (see next note) says horses should have long necks, and short ears, lips, and tails (66. 1).

[††] iii. 71. 12 ff. Of the following sixteenth verse N. says, 'this verse is sometimes omitted'; the marks are twelve in number, two on the head, two on each flank, two on each side of the chest, one on the crupper, and one on the forehead, in the spurious verse; in verse fourteen, ten

Nearly as famous appears to be the steed of Balhi.[†] From the north and west countries Arjuna bought horses of parrot and peacock color, as well as those termed *tittiri*, partridge-colored, *maṇḍūkākhya*, frog-like, *kalmāṣa*, speckled.[‡] Red is also a great favorite in horses, Droṇa's steeds being called 'red, powerful, pleasant to drive, like çoral, copper-mouthed.'[§] Common appellations are black, golden, moon-colored, horn-colored, flamingo-colored, bear-colored; but the finest, of all were Arjuna's own divine steeds, and these were white.[‖]

The reins and goad (the latter, of three pieces) have been already spoken of, in connection with the charioteer. Besides the straps of the harness, the horses sometimes wore leather robes and a net, probably as armor. So also a wooden breastplate seems to have been worn. Such is perhaps the *uraçchada* (vii. 23. 36), The bridle-bit[¶] appears to be the same word as the Greek χαλινός

---

*āvartas* are mentioned. The commentator regards these as 'faulty' spots, which is better than to mention twelve and call them ten, as does Williams. These horses are of the famous Sindh breed. Compare for the *āvartas* iii. 161. 24, where N. renders *vimalākṣāḥ* by *daçāvartaçuddhāḥ*. Bṛh. Saṁh. 66. 2 ff. and Ag. P. 288. 1 ff. give ten good and ten bad *āvartas*, depending on the locality of the twists in the hair.

[*] ix. 8. 22; iii. 269. 6, etc. Compare xiii. 118. 13, *syandaneṣu ca kambojā yuktāḥ paramavājinaḥ*. On the color, compare vii. 23. 74; vi. 79. 50 (*karbura*). In B. Ā. Up. vi. 1, as a type of noble spirit 'a great and lordly horse of the Sindhu country' is used. Bhagadatta (with his Yavanas) has what are called *ājāneya* horses, blooded animals, also called in other descriptions swift and noble as companion epithets. Compare ii. 51. 15; v. 4490 (B. om.). Such *ājāneyas* had also the crown-prince of Hāstina: 'you have all heart can desire,' says his father, 'blooded horses,' etc., ii. 49. 9.

[†] *bālhika*, *bālhijāta*, i. 221. 51; v. 86. 6, etc.; R. i. 6. 24.

[‡] ii. 27. 27; 28. 6; also extolled in 51. 4 (with parrot-noses); 61. 22.

[§] iv. 58. 4 (*tāmrāsyāḥ*). Cf. vii. 132. 29. Droṇa's horses are 'blood-red' (*rakta*); so *çoṇa* in vii. 191. 32 ff.; yellow (*palālakāṇḍa*-color) in vii. 23. 35.

[‖] Compare viii. 77. 3, (*açvāḥ*) *himaçaṅkhavarṇāḥ suvarṇamuktāmāṇijālanaddhāḥ*; vii. 118. 4, *çasiçaṅkhavarṇāḥ* (C. 4687, *çasipuṅkha*); viii. 50. 5, *haṅsavarṇāḥ*, *çaṅkhavarṇāḥ*; viii. 76. 36, *sitābhravarṇāḥ*, *asitaprayuktāḥ*; ix. 11. 41, *hayāḥ . . suvarṇakakṣāḥ . . ṛkṣavarṇāḥ*; viii. 79. 59, *çvetāçvayuktam . . . sughoṣam ugraṁ ratham* (*arjunasya:* compare viii. 38. 12, 'fifty white steeds,' with eighteen more in verse 13; also viii. 37. 26). More might be given, but will not profit us. The various flowers (decorations with which, *āpīḍa*, are common) with which the color of horses vies are given in vii. 23. 6, 24, 28 ff. (cf. R. vi. 19. 46, *kāñcanāpīḍā hayāḥ*).

[¶] *valgā* for *raçmi* is later and doubtful (vii. 27. 23=1217, v. P.W.) for Mbh.; *kavi*, late for *khalīna*, is not found.

but the comparison is etymologically unsound, so that it is more reasonable to suppose with Weber that *khalīna* is a borrowed word, or one of independent origin.*

Outside of these useful trappings† we have a number of purely ornamental ones, such as the tail-bands mentioned in viii. 34. 30. One passage unites 'tail-bands, plumes, breast-harness, bits, ornaments of silver, brass, and gold'; but the last are not explained.‡ The plume, therefore, was not wanting, made of the tail of the *bos grunniens*, which is usually an adornment of the palace, one of the royal insignia, carried by princes upon the field (*cāmara* or *vyajana* and *vāla* together); here an ornament of the horse, probably worn on the head;§ often with the *kakṣā* or *kakṣyā*, the girdle or girth-band, which, like all else capable of decoration, is represented as adorned and bejeweled. The manes, *saṭā*, must be long.‖

Horses have names, as elephants have. Krishṇa's double team of four Kambojan steeds is often mentioned, the two pole-horses bearing the names Çāivya and Sugrīva, and the two outsiders called Maghapuṣpa and Balāhaka. ¶

Special skill in driving horses is claimed by all the knights, though a distinction is attempted by Karṇa, where he says 'Çalya is better than Krishna; I, than Arjuna; Karṇa knows the heart (art) of horses; Çalya, too, has knowledge of steeds.'**

The number of horses has been spoken of above. One hundred horses draw a demon's eight-wheeler (vii. 175. 14), where probably no real fact is reflected. Yudhishthira's car in peace (but called a *jāitro rathavaraḥ*, or car of victory) is described as dragged by eight horses, and covered with a net and with bells.†† One well shot arrow slays a horse: for example, 'the standard with one arrow, the two charioteers (*rathayantārāu*) with two; the *triveṇuka* with three; the bow with one; the horses with four,' where as many horses as arrows are implied.[*]

---

* *rathāç caturyujo hemakhalīnamālinaḥ*, i. 198. 15. The gold nets are mentioned in v. 155. 10; vii. 9. 15. For goad and breastplate, see pp. 192-96; *kaṇṭaka*, armor for horse, in viii. 34. 33.

† The machinery of the horse is shortly grouped in one compound as *īṣādaṇḍakayoktrayugāni*, 'pole, harness, yoke,' vii. 167. 13 (the 'half-yoke' is applied to horse or car, *ratho vidhuraḥ, hayāḥ . . vidhuragrīvāḥ*). The reins are called usually *raçmayaḥ*, but *abhīçu* (*grahaḥ*), viii. 32. 19; vii. 48. 29, is also used.

‡ *vālabandha, uraçchada, khalīna*, viii. 24. 63; *prakīrṇaka*, 19. 43.

§ So ix. 9. 12: compare viii. 27: 33; vii. 163. 22, see cavalry.

‖ Compare vii. 184. 42, where gold yokes are on the horses; and the following *keçarālambibhir yugāiḥ*. Long *saṭā* in vii. 175. 15.

¶ iii. 20. 13; x. 13. 3, etc. The last two are the *pārṣṇivāhāu*.

** *hayajñāna* is a general term, viii. 31. 59 ff. Already noted is Çālihotra (compared to Mātali, Indra's charioteer), who knew the truth of the pedigree of horses (*hayānāṁ kulatattvavit*, iii. 71. 27; Ag. P. 288). In respect of horse-diseases I have noted only xii. 284. 54, where horses are afflicted with *randhrāgata*, but I do not know what that means; it seems from the commentator to be a throat-trouble.

†† *kiṅkiṇījāla*, ii. 61. 4. The net here of the car, not of the horses, is more rarely spoken of, and one is often inclined to doubt whether it is the horse-net or car-net that is meant. It is generally so vaguely used as to leave the matter uncertain. But compare vi. 63. 13, *ūruvegena saṁkarṣan rathajālāni*. Bear-skins or tiger-skins often protect the cars.

Mules are used in war, though occurring oftener in peaceful scenes. When harnessed they are apparently dressed like the horses, and are also covered with the same gold trappings (*hemabhaṇḍa*). Black-haired mules in a white chariot make a princely gift.[†] The ass, *gardabha*, is yoked to a *ratha*, but here a peaceful wagon is meant; the ass is goaded on the nose as the man walks beside it (xiii. 27. 10). Generally when a long journey is to be performed with great speed, mules or asses are taken. In one case a wagon, *yāna*, is dragged by mules going fourteen *yojanas* a day; and some 'black-necked huge-bodied asses' fly a hundred (*yojanas* in a day), a feat performed by Nala's horses also: Asses fattened like camels (also used for draught, xv. 23. 1 ff.) on various nuts, and brought as tribute with camels and horses, are mentioned.[‡] *Yogo yogaḥ!* is the common cry for 'harness up,' our 'putting to' coming near to the original.[§]

The knight of the war-car: A few words in regard to the personal position of the knight of the chariot, before we turn to the cavalry and elephants, or examine the arms of all these fighters. The well-born knight, *çūra*, sometimes *vīra* (though this may not imply nobility), is separated by various grades from those around him, and his performances as a fighter are, so to speak, adjusted to these grades. In nearest proximity is the charioteer, his friend it may be, but socially beneath him. Around him are certain followers and retainers. Of these, supposing him to be a prince or high noble, we must make three divisions. First and nearest stand his 'wheel-guard,' usually one knight each at the sides of his car. These are no humble followers, but his equals in rank, although, as examples show, often his inferiors in age. It is an honorable office for young knights so to 'guard the wheels' of a great champion, and in all probability, remembering the adolescence of many of these young warriors, it was a post sought for them by their parents, that they might not only be taught how to fight, but be protected in the battles by the presence of the champion. Thus Abhimanyu seems to be put under the care of Yudhishthira. The knight is the head of his clan. He is the captain of a large family body. But in the vast hosts depicted in the Epic, we find knights or kings standing at the head of whole hosts, comprising not only the family or clan but hired troops. These *bhṛta* or mercenaries form the third group behind the knight. They are of no importance except as a mass. The knights pay little attention to them, and stand to them in a merely formal relation. But between these two—the family friends or near relations guarding the wheel, and the foot-herd behind, *padānugāḥ*—stand the nearer 'followers' of the knight. These are comprised under the name of *anugāḥ* or *anucarāḥ*, and differ from the closer friends as from the vulgar. Among the *sāinikāḥ* or general soldiers, the *anugāḥ* were the knight's particular backers. I think we shall not err if we take the *anugāḥ* or *anucarāḥ* to mean those immediate followers representing what remains of the clannish corps of an older age. The *anucara* is perhaps nearer than the *padānuga*, and therefore differentiated from him; but he seems to be the same as *anuga*.* There seems to be a certain personal familiarity between these 'followers' and their knight, explainable only on such an assumption. At the knight's death they invariably flee; they are bound up in his success or failure. The *anuga* is often beloved, and we find Karṇa weeping when he sees his *anuga* Durmukha slain, just sent forward to his assistance (vii. 134). As his name denotes, the *anuga* is strictly a 'follower,' to whom conversely the knight is a *puraḥsara*, 'leader.'† To illustrate the connection between knight and followers it may be noted that, in the River-Vision (the most poetical chapter of the whole Epic), each knight returns to earth for a time, appearing to the eyes of his friends, 'bearing the same standard, and with the same car and dress,' as of old; but after the vision has lasted for a little it fades away, and each ghostly warrior returns to his own place in the world of the dead 'with his steeds and with his *padānugāḥ*,' so that these accompany him after death, as before. Here the whole general multitude that had died is meant.*

---

[*] vii. 156. 83 ff.: compare iv. 57. 36; R. vi. 69. 38.

[†] *dadyāṁ çvetam açvatarīrathaṁ yuktam anjanakeçībhiḥ* (*kṛṣṇakeçībhiḥ, açvatarībhir yuvatībhir vā*, N.), viii. 38. 5 ff.

[‡] Fourteen yojanas, v. 86. 12; *çatapātinaḥ*, ii. 51. 25; Nala's horses, iii. 71. 72. *uṣṭravāmīḥ puṣṭāḥ pīluçamīṅgudāiḥ* (as tribute), ii. 51. 4. Compare i. 144. 18–19, *rāsabhayuktena syandanenā 'çugāminā tvaritaṁ gatvā*.

[§] *yogaḥ!* or *sajjīkuru!* literally 'the yoking,' 'get ready'; so *yogam ājñāpayāmāsa*, 'he ordered the horses to be put to,' viii. 11. 3. Compare *sajjīkuruta yānāni ratnāni vividhāni ca*, xvi. 7. 11; so *kalp*, as in R. vi. 34. 20, *kalpyatām me rathaḥ çīghraṁ kṣipram ānīyatāṁ tataḥ*. Compare also xv. 22. 19 ff., where the king is to leave town, and cries to his assembled officers *niryātayata me senām prabhūtarathakuñjarām*, and to the guardians of the women *yānāni vividhāni me sajjīkriyantāṁ sarvāṇi çibikāç ca*, the latter term being equally applicable to the palankeen (the women travel in *yāna* or *çibikā* usually, ib. 23. 12 and xii. 37. 41: compare R. vi. 99. 13, Sītā in a covered *çibikā; sarvā rathagatāḥ kanyāḥ*, vii. 60. 2, is, from context, not opposed); whereupon all cried *yogo yoga iti* and *yujyatām iti*. Compare for different conveyances, *yāna*, R, ii. 111. 45; of an army, R. ii. 124. 20. So, for the order R. ii. 101. 33, *āmantrya sāinyaṁ yujyatāṃ ity acodayat*. In ib. 36 are mentioned *vividhāni yānāni bṛhanti ca laghūni ca*. In Mbh. iii. 73. 31, *mocayitvā* is unharnessing, 'loosing' the yoke, after which the chores were done (*upacarya çāstrataḥ*). The *narayāna* or team of men (xii. 37. 40) may be nothing more than a sedan-chair carried by men in its general use (for it seems a common name, for a genus), and does not belong among the war-vehicles. The women in xvi. 7. 33 follow Arjuna on *açvayuktāi rathāiḥ* and *gokharoṣṭrayutāiḥ*. *Çakaṭa* is the same as *yāna*, but especially a load-wagon.

---

* vi. 118. 44 speaks of the *anucarāḥ* as all being slain, as if a small body. See the general analysis, above, p. 166.

† *anugāmin* is sometimes used for the shorter form; *rathapuraḥsara* as a fixed epithet, xii. 332. 42.

One knight often drives just behind another to protect him, the Hindu notion of defense being not to impede the darts of the protected, still less to guard him from shots if he were a brave knight, but simply to support him from behind, to be ready to aid him in need. Thus Bhīma, wishing to protect the king, 'went behind the king, alone, guarding him in the rear.'† This is the normal position of the 'protecting' knight, who is not really a pro-tector at all, but a rear-guard to a single person. The *anugāḥ* occupied this position as a body. Then came the foot-followers. Compare the foremost hero followed by *çūrā ye ca teṣām padānugāḥ*, viii. 96. 32; *çūrāḥ* are the *anugāḥ*.

The knight's adversaries are generally of his own class. If he becomes *apratirathaḥ*, or has no 'foe-man worthy of his steel,' he rushes about the field till he meets one. Incidentally, as it were, he may shoot a few hundred common soldiers. He never makes a premeditated attack upon the foot-soldiers alone, but when their chief is killed, of whom they are, like the horses, an appendage, they ought to disperse; and if they do not, they are shot as nuisances, not as antagonists. Especially is this the case with the 'heel-catchers,' or soldiers deputed to annoy his rear. These are legitimately shot as cowardly villains, though they never appear to do much harm.‡

The knight in his chariot is equal to an army. Frequently we find thousands running from one mounted hero. In the case of a national hero, of course, no bounds are set in description. 'Through fear of Arjuna everybody, even the knights, ran away; the horse-riders abandoned their horses; the elephant-riders, their elephants—falling from war-cars, elephants, and horses' (vi. 55. 25–26). In this way we often find the war-cars in heaps,' 'crowds,' etc., and a confusion so great that the phrase frequently turns up 'there was no chariot-path in that place:' so dense the crowd as to be impenetrable.[*] I close this view of the charioted knight with a description of action in car-fighting, *rathayuddha*, found in the seventh book (vii. 103. 28 ff.). 'Then much enraged, and licking his lips,[†] he looked, but found no spot on the foe's body not protected by armor. Nevertheless he shot; with sharp, well-delivered, deathlike arrows he rendered lifeless the steeds, and slew both the side-drivers; he cut the foe's bow and his quiver; he cut off his hand-guard (*hastāvāpa*). Then the ambidextrous knight proceeded to destroy the chariot, splintering it with arrows. Next the foe, deprived of his war-car, with two sharp arrows he pierced; pierced by arrows was he through both hand-guards in the flesh beneath the nails.[‡] Then the kingly foe was tormented, and flight became his chief desire; but unto him in that extreme of need flocked his best bowmen, anxious to rescue (their king) overwhelmed by the darts of their foe. And the conquering foe they hemmed in with thousands of chariots, with harnessed elephants and horses,[§] with floods of thick-packed footmen; so that neither the knight nor his charioteer nor the chariot was to be seen, for the rain of the arrows and the billows of the people. But the great knight by the power of his arrows broke that protecting array (*varūthinī*), and wounded the elephants, now crowding about him. Smitten were the elephants, and smiting they rushed upon his chariot; but firm in all that tumult stood the car.'

---

* xv. 33. 13 ff., 17. In this verse (*savāhāḥ sapadānugāḥ*) *vāha* might almost be taken in the sense proposed by Bühler for the passage quoted above from Vasishtha, 'with their companies and personal followers.' But the ordinary meaning suits the passage.

† *pṛṣṭhe rakṣan*, viii. 82. 14.

‡ viii. 75. 15, etc. The *pārṣṇigrāhāḥ*, 'heelcatchers,' gave their name to the one of the practical divisions of a king's 'circuit.' See above, p. 75, and compare *tasya pārṣṇiṁ grahīṣyāmo javenā 'bhiprayāsyataḥ*, iv. 53. 17.

B. *Cavalry.*—I find in the Epic no word corresponding to this heading, but several for 'horse-riders' (*açvāroha, hayāroha, hayārohavara, vājin, sādin*), all meaning 'those mounted on a horse.'[‖] This fact shows the use of the cavalry. Zimmer says that horse-riding is known to the Vedic age, but finds no mounted cavalry in battle. In the Epic age we have, indeed, cavalry, but unorganized.[¶] The mounted soldiers are recognized as a body (*kulam*) apart from others, of course, but do not act together. They appear as concomitants of the war-cars, dependent groups; but separate horsemen appear everywhere. Their employment was much influenced by that of the elephants. A body of horsemen is routed by an elephant. They were therefore detailed in small numbers to guard the war-cars and keep on the flanks of their own elephants. To the latter, indeed, they are formally assigned, but seem generally to be circling about the chariots.

---

[*] *Vṛndu, vrāta, vaṅça* (*rathānām*) are found: compare vi. 63. 12, *pothayan rathavṛndāni vājivṛndāni ca;* and viii. 60. 30; 56. 58; iv. 53. 16, etc.; *nā 'sid rathapathas tatra*, vii. 187. 20, etc.

[†] *sṛkkiṇī parisaṁlihan*, a common expression.

[‡] *hastatalayoḥ; nakhamāṅsāntareṣubhiḥ* (= *sandhir ārṣaḥ*. N.). C. omits this last expression, and the next also.

[§] *kalpitāiḥ kuṅjarāir hayāiḥ*; usually *kḷpta*.

[‖] Compare for terms vi. 46. 29; 55. 25; 63. 15; 71. 16; viii. 21. 23, etc.

[¶] Pāṇini gives us *āçva*, but this is not necessarily cavalry.

Horse-back riding is so common, in peace as well as war,* that we are rather surprised at the indifferent riding displayed; for the cavalry-men are mainly conspicuous through falling off their horses, quite often from fear alone. They are generally grouped with the *hastisādinaḥ* or elephant-riders, as a force antithetical to the main strength of the army, the car-men. Thus, two knights drive on their cars 'with horses and horse-riders, as if with rushing swans;' and we read of riders (violating the code!) fighting with the chariot-men, 'piercing their heads.'† The verses preceding, with the swan-metaphor, describe the cavalry-horses as carrying plumes and *āpīḍa*, which the commentator takes for quivers, but which probably means garlands of flowers.‡ The same passage adds the fate of 'many riders of horses' slain by one knight 'with well-knotted arrows' (vi. 46. 23).

The horse-riders form a sort of aides-de-camp, and are dispatched with messages by the king, not being ordinary cavalry-men, but knights on horseback attending the monarch.§

Although the horse-riders are supposed to attack only their like, they contend with the chariot-men, as we saw above, and fight from rear and side the elephants which they dare not meet face to face; as the 'mountain-beasts,' when maddened by the fight, repeatedly overturn both war-cars and horse and rider together.‖

In one instance, the horsemen attack the other horsemen with darts, but immediately after they attack a charioteer in the same way.¶ In another case, a knight overthrows car-men from their car and the riders from their horses' backs, more commonly said of the riders.[*]

---

* Riding was a common amusement. A son says to his father in i. 100. 61: 'You seem to be in ill health; you look green and poorly; you don't go out ahorse any more' (*na cā 'çvena viniryāsi*).

† vi. 46. 22, *açvāir agryajavāiḥ kecid āplutya mahato rathān* (*rathāt?*). *çirānsy ādadire vīrā rathinām açvasādinaḥ.*

‡ *hayāir api hayārohāç cāmarāpīḍadhāribhiḥ, hansāir iva mahāvegāir anyonyam abhividrutāḥ*, vi. 46. 20 (*cāmarakalāpa*, N.). The *sādinaḥ* (seated equites) are opposed to the *pādātāḥ* (pedites), and to the *rathinaḥ*, those in petorrita. Compare vi. 71. 43; 73. 43; 75. 25; 79. 61: vii. 145. 36; viii. 28. 19, 22. 'Those on the shoulders of elephants' (*gajaskandhāḥ*) stand opposed to the foot-soldiers and to *rathopastha*- and *vājipṛṣṭha*-men, viii. 78. 55 (here, as usual, the form *pādātāḥ*).

§ vi. 120. 28: cf. *çūrā hayasādinaḥ*, vi. 105. 11 (here a body-guard).

‖ *sāçvārohān hayān kāñçcid unmathya varavāraṇāḥ, sahasā cikṣipuḥ . . sāçvārohān viṣāṇāgrāir utkṣipya turagān gajāḥ, rathāughān abhimṛdnantaḥ sadhvajān abhicakramuḥ*, etc., vi. 46. 26–27.

¶ vi. 57. 11, 19.

The horse-riders are the fighters especially spoken of as 'drunk with fighting,' *yuddhaçāuṇḍa*.[†] The arms of the cavalry-men are usually darts only, but we find also spears and knives or short swords used by them.[‡]

As the riders fight alone, when killed they fall unnoticed, and their horses run loose, increasing the uproar and confusion (vi. 105. 21 ff.). Their most efficient aid was given when they were hurled against the foe after the elephants had become useless, and the throng was too dense and mixed for the employment of war-cars. Then the agile and single horsemen could do good work on the herd of frightened foot-soldiers, unimpeded by fear of heavier foes (so in ix. 23. 60 ff.). The formal and unreal arrangement of the army distributes ten or one hundred mounted horsemen as a guard to each elephant (see below).

The horsemen are represented as falling asleep on their horses' backs when the fight has been continued too long, with the elephant riders and charioteers keeping them company in weariness.[§]

Outside of regular cavalry-men, we find that the chariot-knights and kings often flee on horses when their cars are disabled, and no other refuge presents itself, such as leaping into a friendly car (the common escape) (ix. 25. 23).

The horse of the cavalry-man was not driven by a goad, as was the chariot-horse, but by a whip. This (described as gilded) was fastened to the wrist of the rider, leaving his hand free.[‖] The whip gives us a figure in describing a fiery-tempered man, 'restless under that word as is a fine horse under the whip.'[¶] It is doubtful whether saddles were used; but the bridle and bit are to be assumed, as in the case of the chariot-horse.

---

[*] vi. 108. 33. Compare the like accounts in vi. 63. 15: *sādinaç cā 'çvapṛṣṭhebhyaḥ* a knight knocks down with his club; as he does the elephant-riders, infantry, and all other opponents, 'like an elephant grinding down reeds' (*naḍvalāni*, ib. 14).

[†] R. ii. 125. 14. Also of barbarians on elephants, Mbh. vii. 112. 17.

[‡] vii. 165. 21, *sādinaḥ sādibhiḥ sārdham prāsaçaktyṛṣṭipāṇayaḥ samāgacchan.* 'Compare arms of elephant- and horse-riders as *prāsa, mudgara, nistrinça, paraçvadha, gadā*, R. vi. 52. 11; *prāsa* especially for horse-rider is assumed, R. vi. 49. 67; and above, vi. 57. 19.

[§] 'Some fell asleep on the backs of their horses, some in the chariot-nest, some on the elephants' shoulders,' vii. 184. 38.

[‖] *baddhāḥ sādibhujāgreṣu suvarṇavikṛtāḥ kaçāḥ* (along with beryl-handed *aṅkuças* for the elephants), viii. 58. 30. The chariot-horse was pricked with a *pratoda*, the elephant with a *tottra* and an *aṅkuça*, and the cavalry-horse was driven by a *kaçā*, vii. 134. 6.

[¶] *vaco na mamṛṣe . . uttamāçvaḥ kaçām iva*, ix. 32. 36. Compare viii. 21. 23, and R. ii. 16. 22, *vākkaçayā* (Epic, loc. cit., *vākpratodena*) *paripīḍitaḥ kaçaye 'va hayaḥ sādhus tvarāvān.*

Probably the frequently-mentioned blankets found on the field served as saddles. The riders wore breast-plates and turbans besides their arms.*

C. *The elephant-riders.*—The common names for the elephant used in the Epic, *gaja*, *nāga*, *dvipa*, *hastin*, *kareṇu*, *karin*, *dantin*, *dvirada*, *mātaṅga*, *kuñjara*, *vāraṇa*, *pota*, for the most part serve merely as plain descriptive adjectives ('the twice-drinker,' 'the handed one,' 'the tusked one,' 'the defender,' etc.), and are synonymous.†

These beasts were employed *en masse* as a moving wall in attack at the outset of battle, as a standing wall in defense, and, thirdly, as individual foragers through the confused crowd of blood-seeking desperadoes that make the back-ground of every battle-scene. More rarely, they were used by respectable knights in a civilized manner. But, as generally presented to us, we find them mounted by a gang of low soldiers sitting on the shoulders of the beast (*gajaskandhāḥ*), who were armed with knives, daggers, pots of oil, stones, and other weapons and missiles, with which to strike the soldiers beneath. The *gajārohāḥ* or *hastisādinaḥ* were also set to catch the victims below by the hair and then cleave their necks, or to slip forward upon the tusks and slay the horses or men that the weapons of the beasts might miss. The cavalry are especially forward in attacking elephants, but always covertly. It required a special study to be master of an elephant, and the 'elephant-science' was an important part of military discipline.* The weapons usually employed against the elephant are (iron) arrows; but the statement sometimes made in the Epic, that a knight kills an elephant with one arrow, like so many others of like nature, must be taken with the latitude that Hindu longitude demands. The remark of Arjuna that he can kill the Kirāṭa with the end of his bow,† as a man does an elephant with the end of a sharp stake (of iron), shows perhaps that this was the method of disposing of them if they became ungovernable.‡

---

* In viii. (21. 23) 24. 66 (horsemen armed with darts, swords, spears, and wearing *kañcuka* and *uṣṇīṣa*); the *khalīna*, coverings, etc., of vi. 54. 59 ff., might belong to any horses. I hesitate to take *pīṭhaka* in i. 84. 21 as 'saddle,' (as P. W. suggests). The commentator understands a royal team (*rājayogya*), and describes it as one drawn by men; the *narayāna* we have had above. The context would favor a vehicle, perhaps like *çibikā* in the next verse, which would sufficiently explain the 'seat' (*narayānaviçeṣās takhatarāvā iti mleccheṣu prasiddhāḥ*), and give the same meaning of couch as in *pīṭhikā*, e. g. R. v. 13. 54. The *pīṭhamarda* (iv. 21. 33) does not necessarily imply a saddle, as the seat may be a blanket (*kambola*), or *açvāstara*, *paristoma*, *rāṅkava*—all these being used on the horses, 'spread over them' (vi. 96. 74); although in itself we might well regard *pīṭha* as the saddle, were it not for the negative evidence of lack of such things in descriptions teeming with everything wearable by horse or driver. In vii. 23. 37 we find of a chariot's steeds *rukmapīṭhāvakīrṇā hayāḥ* (C. *pṛṣṭha*, v. N.): taken by the commentator to mean yellow-backed steeds, but certainly not here saddled. But compare from the Puranic period Var. P. 96. 10, *açvāḥ* . . *kāñcanapīṭhanaddhārohāir yuktāḥ*. *Paryāṇa*, saddle, is not used. Compare *padma* of elephants, below. Worth noting is the fact that the earliest Greek allusion to India contains a reference to what some interpret as saddled camels used like horses. (Aeschylus, Suppl. 284; cf. Hd. iii. 99.) In vii. 112. 55, horses are made to drink wine before the fight.

† The *gajāroha* rides the *dantin*, vi. 55. 25; etc.; and the *gajāroha* rides the *kuñjara*, xvi. 7. 36.

The great chiefs, princes, kings, mount elephants so rarely that we may be entitled to infer that the practice of a king's fighting from a great howdah (*vimāna*) on an elephant's back is later than the other methods of car-fighting, and that mention of it will be among the later additions. It was probably first customary in peaceful jaunts, and then extended to war; the latter must have been synchronous with abdication of warrior prowess in the main; yet we find a few instances of elephants being ridden in war, notably by the Yavana prince.[*]

---

* *gajaçikṣā* with *nītiçāstra*, i. 109. 19; compare viii. 38. 16, *hastiçikṣakāir vinītāḥ*. The art consisted as much as anything in keeping one's position. Compare vii. 87. 19, where the 'harnessed and cruel' elephants (*varmiṇaḥ, rāudrakarmiṇaḥ*) are described as 'ridden well' (*suvirūḍhā hastyārohāiḥ*). In attacking one crawls under and smites in vii. 26. 23 (*añjalikāvedha*).

† Compare xvi. 7. 62, *dhanuṣkoṭyā tadā dasyūn avadhīt.*

‡ Compare the arrangement of the elephants in the day's opening array, described in the battle-orders above. In mid-battle such a compound line is also spoken of as the 'line of elephants,' attacked by one knight (*nāgānīkam*, vi. 115. 29); but ordinarily only disordered single beasts are found. The descriptions are much alike; the riders' reaching down, seizing by the hair (*keçapakṣe*), and beheading the foe, is spoken of in vi. 57. 14; where also, 11 ff., we find the cavalry attacked by *prāsa* and the elephants by *nārācā*, (iron) arrows, and, 16, the 'hero knowing well the battle' crawling out on the tusk, *kariviṣāṇasthā.* The *vīro raṇaviçāradaḥ* and *gajaçikṣāstravedī*, here so called, shows more respect for this kind of fighting than our disgust can appreciate. The training is required not only of the elephant leader or keeper (*mahāmātra*), but of the riders, who are 'experts' in this sort of fighting (viii. 22. 3), and, as this verse shows, in part foreigners (*mekalāḥ koçalā madrā daçārṇā niṣadhās tathā, gajayuddheṣu kuçalāḥ kaliṅgāiḥ saha*). Compare vii. 112. 28; xii. 101. 4, *prācyā mātaṅgayuddheṣu kuçalāḥ kūṭayodhinaḥ*. The verse viii. 78. 55-6 shows the ordinary position of these riders to be on the shoulders of the elephant, as distinct from those upon the back of the horse, or the 'lap' of the war-car (*kṛtvā çūnyān rathopasthān vājipṛṣṭhān . . nirmanuṣyān gajaskandhān*). For the fight of elephant against elephant we have the proverbial comparison *pratyudyayāu rathenā 'çu gajam pratigajo yathā*. viii. 86. 21, and an example in vii. 26. 36; for the way in which the beasts trampled and tusked their adversaries while themselves attacked, one of many examples: *mahāgajān pārçvataḥ pṛṣṭhataç cāi 'va nijaghnur hayasādinaḥ, vidrāvya ca bahūn açvān nāgā viṣāṇāiç cā 'pare, jaghnur mamṛduç cā 'pare, sāçvārohāṅç ca turaṁgān viṣāṇāir vivyadhū ruṣā, apare cikṣipur vegāt pragṛhya* . . . viii. 28. 20 ff. Like accounts in vii. 153. 5; vi. 46. 27. For weapons used, see more particularly below. Arjuna's comparison of his *dhanuṣkoṭi* to the *çūlāgra* with which an elephant is killed is found iii. 39. 48. It may be a sword. The tusk itself is called pole-tooth, *īṣādanta*, from its size, v. 86. 7 (*lāṅgala*); the same verse containing the oft-noted rut-mark of this beast (compare i. 221. 53), with the implication, further, of eight attendants for one elephant being the proper thing: *nityaprabhinnān mātaṅgān īṣādantān prahāriṇaḥ, aṣṭānucaram ekāikam aṣṭāu dāsyāmi* . . . . The capture of elephants is noticed in R. vi. 62. 35, *arthāir arthā nibadhyante gajāir iva mahāgajāḥ*: not, therefore, by females, as Strabo asserts. Vāyu P. i. 16. 19 alludes to the training of wild elephants by a hook.

The elephants were attended by 'protectors,' both the animal that served as general 'guard of the herd,'[†] and the human flank-protectors, of which we find four, one for each corner of the beast.[‡] But we also find seven car-men, guard of one elephant, as the normal number.[§]

The still more formal distribution of forces gives a rather different picture of the relative use of the elephant. This account groups all the fighters engaged, and may be here given in full. The elephants are looked upon in this passage not as an independent array, but as adjuncts to the knights in chariots, ten or fifty about each car. Here we find that seven men (not in chariots, as above) attend each elephant, two leading it by hooks (*aṅkuçadharāu*), two carrying bows, two carrying swords, one carrying a spear and club (*çaktipinākadhṛt*). According to the same description, the distribution of horse-riders was thus: if each war-car had ten elephants, then each elephant had ten horse-riders, and each horse-rider in turn had a guard of ten foot-men, *pādarakṣāḥ ;* if each car had fifty elephants, then each elephant had one hundred horsemen, and each horseman seven foot-men.[‖]

---

[*] Compare i. 69. 13, *taṁ* (*rājānam*) *devarājapratimam mattavāraṇadhūrgatam . . niryāntam anujagmire.* In war we find a prince on an elephant in iv. 65. 6 (the beast is slain forthwith by one arrow in the forehead). Duryodhana enters the war thus, vi. 20. 7. Compare Bhagadatta, vi. 95. 33 ff.; vii. 26. 19 ff.; and Wilson, iv. 294. The Greeks give a special account of the Hindu elephant (see Arrian) and manœuvres with them, partly confirmed by our text (see I. A. vi. 239).

[†] *gajayūthapa*, vi. 54. 41, etc.

[‡] *gajānām pādarakṣāḥ*, vi. 46. 13 ; four in iv. 65. 6 : these are knights in chariots supporting a prince who rides an elephant.

[§] vi. 81. 14, *nāgenāge rathāḥ sapta sapta cā 'çvā ratherathe, anvaçvaṁ daça dhānuṣkā dhānuṣke daça carmiṇaḥ.* Compare xvi. 7. 36, *kuñjarāir gajārohā yayuḥ . . sapādarakṣāiḥ saṁyuktāḥ sāntarāyudhikā yayuḥ.*

[‖] So in v. 155. 16 ff. The Agni Purāṇa gives only fifteen footmen, and other accounts also vary, as three horses and five footmen are sometimes quoted. Three bowmen were on an elephant, according to Megasthenes. Compare Wilson, iv. 292 ff. The Matsya array numbers 8,000 chariots, 1,000 elephants, 60,000 horses, in iv. 31. 33. A saint sets the example of having 100 elephants to each car, and 1,000 horses to each elephant, vii. 60. 3–4. The truth of all this reckoning is simply that we have different orders recommended at different times, by different persons, and this late arrangement of the Epic itself is purely formal, and self-contradictory, if we take it as a law.

These 'mountainous beasts' (viii. 85. 4, etc.) are armed with spikes and iron harness. They wear a *kakṣyā* or girth about the middle, and carry flags, *vāïjayantī*, emblems, hooks, quivers, guards, neckchains, bells, wreaths, nets, umbrellas, and blankets, possibly with rings about the feet.[*]

The *tottra*, prod, and *aṅkuça*, hook, are used to urge and direct the beast. To these we have perhaps *kaṅkaṭa* to add, as a goad.[†] The elephant is at his best when sixty years old, and then a type of male vigor; gift-elephants are so spoken of, this being the perfect age.[‡] But even a young elephant is formidable: 'then he became a young elephant' is a self-explaining metaphor on the battle-field.[§] No special sagacity is shown by the elephants, except in the burning of a forest, where they try to squirt the fire out (i. 223. 80); but they are celebrated, as the horses are, for their endurance of noises when well-trained (ii. 61. 16); and, like the horses, they weep in battle.[‖] They are occasionally called by pet names. Droṇa names his elephant for his son.* A sort praised in vii. 112. 17 is *āñjanaka.* The metaphor of the horse impatient under the whip is repeated in the case of the word-wounded knight enduring contempt as little as an elephant crazed by the hook.† Their terrible noise is often alluded to.‡

---

[*] Compare above, and v. 152. 16, *gajāḥ kaṇṭakasaṁnāhāḥ, lohavarmottaracchadāḥ*, with the like description of metal armor in xii. 100. 7–8. Compare R̄. vi. 111. 10, *hemakakṣyābhiḥ saghaṇṭābhiḥ kareṇubhiḥ;* and R. v. 80. 32, *kaṇṭakavarma*, of elephants. See, too, Mbh. vii. 36. 34; and the (gold) *jāla* or net fastened to the elephant in vi. 20. 7. The *kaṅkaṇa* or foot-ring, iii. (C.) 15757, is *kiṅkiṇi* (*-bhūṣaṇaḥ*) in B. 271. 22. The *grāiveyā*(*ṇi*), necklaces, were probably for use as well as ornaments; they are associated with 'bells and spears' (vi. 54. 54 : cf. 96. 69). The coverings, as in the case of the horses, go by various names, *kambala*, *āstara*, *āstaraṇa*, etc., and are of wool or goat-hair (*rāṅkara;* the best woolen stuff, *āvikam*, from the mountaineers, Pārvatīya, v. 86. 9). Colored woolen blankets, *kuthā*, are also common (vi. 57. 26; viii. 24. 64). *Paristoma* may be a bolster; it is found with the other coverings on carriages and elephants, and is said to be of different colors. The elephants themselves are dark (-blue) or speckled, *gajā nīlāḥ* of vi. 59. 15, etc. Indra's white elephant does not appear. *Padminaḥ* qualifying *gajāḥ* may mean speckled. It might also mean 'bearing a high saddle': literally, 'furnished with (something like) a lotus,' used usually of spots on the forehead. But in i. 198. 16, N. defines *padma* as an eight-cornered, eight-pillared saddle, i. e. a howdah. Compare 'the gold-girdled, wreathed, gold-decked *padminaḥ*' elephants of ii. 61. 15 (N. here 'speckled'). In vii. 115. 55, *vimāna* is howdah (later *varaṇḍaka*). In the first passage the tusks are gilded. The bells are called 'sharp-sounding' (*paṭughaṇṭāḥ*) in i. 221. 54. Gold girdles and flags also in R.; e. g. *gajayodhā gajāç cai 'va hemakakṣāḥ patākinaḥ*, R. ii. 101. 35. Compare Mbh. vi. 60. 4.

[†] *Kaṅkaṭa*, e. g. vii. 187. 47, may mean breast-plate or goad. The *tottra*, vii. 134. 6 : *aṅkuça*, vii. 29. 17 (*sarvaghāti*); in ix. 20. 16, both of these urge the 'elephant-king;' compare vi. 45. 5; and also ib. 55. 32 (for cattle, *aṣṭrā* is the proper goad). The 'sound of bells and elephants' goads' is here mentioned. The goad, like the whip, is gilded, vii. 148. 46. Compare vii. 29. 19b–21a (C. omits).

[‡] *ṣaṣṭihāyanāḥ, prabhinnāḥ*, iv. 31. 31, etc. As a gift, compare viii. 38. 9.

[§] *bhīṣmo poto 'bhavat tadā*, vi. 81. 45; *poto* as 'an elephant of ten years' seems too young.

[‖] *açrūṇi mumucur nāgāḥ*, ix. 23. 24.

D. *Weapons.*—The distinction between offensive and defensive weapons is naturally not to be attempted in all cases. I divide for the sake of convenience, and shall treat with the strictly offensive weapons the non-offensive appurtenances of the same.

The arms inevitably first are bow, quiver, and arrow, as one group.§

1. The bow: This is the weapon κατ' ἐξοχήν, for, as in the Veda, *āyudha* is both the general word for weapon and, without limitation, for the bow.‖ More specific names for this weapon are the commonly used words *dhanus*, *cāpa*, *çarāsana*, and (from their material) *kārmuka*, *çārṅga*. ¶

---

* *açvatthāme 'ti hi gajaḥ khyāto nāmnā*, vii. 190. 17. The name, from its assumed derivation, fits an elephant better than a boy, and we might also, regarding the age of each, imagine that the boy was named for the elephant, but it is said otherwise: *açvasye 'vā 'sya yat sthāma nadataḥ pradiço gatam, açvatthāmāi 'va bālo 'yaṁ tasmān nāmnā bhaviṣyati*, i. 130. 48–49. The immortal elephants all have names, the most famous being Indra's Āirāvata. Compare v. 99. 15, and the verse *āirāvataḥ puṇḍarīko vāmanaḥ kumudo 'ñjanaḥ, puṣpadantaḥ sarvabhāumaḥ supratīkaç ca diggajāḥ*, Am. Koç. 1. 1. 2. 5; Ag. P. 19. 27; Bṛ. Saṁ. 32. 1; K. Nīt. xvi. 8; Lassen, I. A. i. 364.

† iv. 66. 1. Compare the same figure, R. ii. 39. 43 (*tottra*).

‡ *bṛṅhita*, ix. 9. 14; 55. 42. The Bṛh. Nār. P. 10. 15 ff. gives *hreṣita* as the sound of horses; *bṛṅhita* as that of elephants; *ṭam* as that of bow and arrow (compare *ṭaṅku*, *ḍamaru*, doubtless onomatopoetic), and *phīṭ* as the noise of the war-car. In closing this topic, the exact statements of the *dhanurveda* in the Agni Purāṇa on the use of the steeds, elephants, and arms employed may be quoted as appropriate, though not finally explaining the more vague statements of the Epic. Thus, at the end of chapter 251 we find three horses given to the car; two hook-bearers, one leader, two shoulder-riders, and two swordsmen given to each elephant; previous to this we have a purely Epic list of ordinary arms, and the statement that the sword is worn on the left, the quiver on the right, the noose is ten hands long, the arrows are twelve *muṣṭis* long, the bow is four hands, and smaller for the foot-soldiers; the soldier should shoot low, etc. The divisions of weapons. etc., as in the Epic (compare Ag. P. 248. 1 ff., 24, 36 ff.; 249. 2 ff.; 250. 1ff.; 251 to end).

§ Rājendralāla Mitra remarks, Ind. Ar. i. 297, that *dhanurdhara* (bow-holder) is even to-day applied to one that knows how to achieve 'success in other walks of life.' This art being well learned indicated a perfect warrior. The bow is at all times the type: e. g. *rāmaḥ . . çreṣṭhaḥ sarvadhanuṣmatām*, R. v. 30. 5 (see below, on Dhanurveda). Bow, arrow, and breast-plate are the weapons and defense of the early period. Compare Āit. Br. 7. 19 (Weber, *Ind. Stud.* x. 30), *athāi 'tāni kṣatrasyā 'yudhāni yad açvarathaḥ kavaca iṣudhanva.*

‖ *sarvāyudha*, vii. 175. 12; the bow, vi. 118. 43, etc.

¶ The form *dhanvan* (*dhanva*) is rare, but occurs in composition: *agradhanvā*, viii. 65. 1; *dṛḍhadhanvā*, vii. 61. 9 (compare *dṛḍhavedhana*, sure shot, in *nimitte dūrapātitve laghutve dṛḍhavedhane . . bravītu . .*

The 'bowman' is often synonymous with 'charioteer,' but may be used of footmen in the field.* The end of the bent bow was the place whence, as the descriptions show, the arrow was shot; and I take it this means that the bow was bent into a circle, so that the arrow head seemed to lie back of the two bow-ends.†

The favorite material for making this weapon is the *kṛmuka* wood, and this word used alone as adjective indicates the bow.‡ The horn-bow appears, however, to have been the best, for it was this that Vishnu used.§ The Greeks report at an early date the use of cane bows by the Hindus, as well as of iron-tipped cane arrows.‖ The length of the bow is several times spoken of as *tāla-mātra*, a 'palm' long, which, when compared with the numerical qualification employed in *ṣaḍaratni*, may probably be interpreted as six cubits in length. But we hear of the bow of a demon being a cubit broad and twelve cubits long, and the shooting-strifes for a wife in the Epic and in the Rāmāyaṇa alike would indicate an (unusual) use of very heavy bows: the scene in the Epic representing far-distant shooting; that in the Rāmāyaṇa, expressly a weighty bow. According to Egerton, five feet is the ordinary length of the Hindu bow (generally of bamboo).¶ As in the Vedic age, the knight held the bow as high as possible: that is, with the shaft level to the eye, and well forward, pulling the arrow back to his ear; and he must therefore have raised the bow perpendicularly, not horizontally, and not have pulled, as did Homer's heroes,

---

*viçeṣam*, vii. 74. 23); *dhanva* in *dhanurdharāya devāya priyadhanvāya dhanvine . . (namaḥ)*, vii. 202. 44. Like *çarāsana* is *çarāvāpa*, a name of the quiver (not the 'bow,' P. W.) from regarding it as a storehouse of arrows. Examples in vi. 90. 61; vii. 188. 21 (*çarāsana* and *çarāvāpa*): cf. viii. 77. 42 (*dhanuḥkāçāṁ çarāvāpām . . nadīm*); vii. 14. 12; 156. 177.

[*] *dhanvin* = *rathin*, vii. 103. 33. The term connotes even a slave in R. ii. 92. 15. But the usual use is as in vii. 34. 17; R. vi. 35. 10, *dhanvī rathastho 'tiratho 'tivīraḥ*, 'a bowman, a charioteer, a splendid charioteer, a splendid hero.'

[†] The expression *dhanuṣkoṭyā 'bhicoditaḥ*, 'hurled by the bow-end' (viii. 35. 17), is to be taken more prosaically, as merely indicating the strength of the bow. *Dhanuṣkoṭi* is in the Vedic language *ārtnī*. The later language has *aṭanī* as the notch on the end, perhaps a dialectic equivalent.

[‡] *kārmuka* as bow, iv. 38. 11; 64. 2; 43. 11, etc.; compare *kārmuka*, M. xi. 139.

[§] *çārṅga*, viii. 79. 23, etc.

[‖] Hd. vii. 65.

[¶] Arjuna's bow is called *tālamātra*, i. 189. 20; v. 160. 108; Droṇa's is a *ṣaḍaratnidhanuḥ*, i. 167. 25. Another palm-estimate is that of *vyāyāmasaham atyarthaṁ tṛṇarājasamam* (*gāṇḍivam*) in iv. 40. 6, where the bow is also (7) gilded, and 'without holes' (*avraṇam*). Compare *tālamātraṁ dhanur gṛhya*, vi. 49. 35; *tālamātrāṇi cāpāni*, vii. 45. 16. The demon's long bow is described in vii. 175. 19. Compare x. 18. 6, a like bow of five *kiṣkus*.

to the breast. The great bow so pulled looked like a crescent, or, in view of its terrible appearance, is likened to the weapon of Indra.*

Arjuna alone is 'left-handed' (*savyasācin*), or, more truly, ambidexter, and uses either hand to draw the string.†

The string (*jyā*) of the bow should be made of *mūrvā*-grass. It is a mistake to suppose that (as the Nītip. teaches) the bow was strung with two cords at once. The cord is noosed at each end, and consists of different strands, but bound together into one string. The sound of the bow-string twanging on the hand-guard of leather is often alluded to as one of the common noises of battle.‡

---

* The expression 'up to the ear' is used either of bow or of arrow. Compare viii. 90. 57, *tato 'rjuno dvādaçabhiḥ sumuktāir varāhakarṇāin niçitāiḥ ṣamarpya, nārācam āçīviṣatulyavegam ākarṇapūrṇāyatam utsasarja*; ix. 28. 5, *ākarṇaprahitaḥ* (*çaraḥ*); viii. 83. 39, *supuṅkhena suyantritena susaṁçitāgreṇa çareṇa ākarṇamuktena samāhitena* (*çūraḥ . . çiro jahāra*); vii. 47. 9, *rukmapuṅkhāiḥ . . ākarṇasamacoditāiḥ*; vii. 156. 184, *mumocā 'karṇapūrṇena dhanuṣā çaram*; R. vi. 51. 75, *karṇāyata visṛṣṭena çareṇā 'nataparvaṇā*; R. vi. 79. 16, *bāṇam ākarṇāt pūrayitvā sasarja.* The bow is 'full' when rounded; then the epithet is carried over to the arrow. Compare Il. iv. 123 for the Homeric view: *νευρὴν μὲν μαζῷ πελασεν.* The size and shape are indicated, as stated above, in vi. 44. 17; vii. 38. 18; 40. 33; 124. 35; 156. 111, *āyatakārmukaḥ*; 167. 46; 169. 28. Gāṇḍīva (Arjuna's bow) looks like a wheel of fire, it is bent so far into a circle (*agnicakra*, iv. 64. 14). Compare R. vi. 51. 87, where the arrow is joined to the *āgneyam aṣtram*, and both it and the bow 'gleam' (*jajvāla*). The circle is expressly stated to be the shape taken by the bow. Compare references above with i. 133. 3; and vii. 160. 47, *maṇḍalīkṛtakārmukaḥ*, 'one whose bow is bent into a circle.'

† vii. 143. 34. In vi. 59. 96, *vicakarṣa dorbhyām mahādhanuḥ*, we have an exceptional act, probably uncalled for by actual necessity, as the bow was of course stretched back by the hand, or even by the fingers alone: *çaram . . . aṅgulībhir vyakarṣata*, i. 132. 59.

‡ In iii. 23. 3; vii. 90. 25, etc., we find the *jyā māurvī.* Compare viii. 21. 23, *māurvyā talatre nyahanat.* The *jyāçata* of viii. 90. 98 speaks in fact against a plurality of strings (general verses on the use of the bow-string. *jyāvadhāna*, etc., ib. 99–100). Arjuna's bow has one string noosed at each end, *jyāpāça* (compared with the two *upadhāna*), iv. 35. 16. When one bow-string breaks, another has to be tied on, iv. 59. 9: *yojayāmāsa navayā māurvyā gāṇḍivam.* Compare iii. 168. 76, *ajarām . . jyām . . gāṇḍive samayojayat.* The *mūrva* string constantly used in the Epic is partly replaced by a string of hemp and hide in the later Agni-Purāṇa; and here metal as well as horn and wood (or 'iron and horn mixed') is employed in the making of bows (which are further, according to this authority, four cubits in length); but the bamboo is most extolled. This passage, Ag. P. 244. 4 ff. (quoted without reference by Wilson and R. Mitra), might there have been contrasted with the Epic usage distinctly earlier (compare *dhanūṅṣi çarāṅç ca dīptān māurvīç ca* in iii. 23. 8, etc.) Some technicalities may be mentioned here. Drawing the bow is *vikṛṣya, utsṛjya, ānamya, vidhunvan, visphārayan*; the shooting of the arrow is *visṛjan*, or a compound of *as* or of *sic*, 'casting' or 'emission;' *cyu* is also used in the same way. Of the bow-string we find *vikarṣan*, 'stretching:' *avasṛjya*, 'letting go;' in case of a knight ready to shoot, *avamṛjya*, 'fingering the bow-string,' is used. *Sajya, sajja* are used of the bow, but as well of the arrow. Compare for

As to the decorations of the bow, it is generally described first as being 'pure,' that is spotless, and then as 'of gold' or 'golden-backed:' by which we may understand some kind of gilding or gold ornamentation; and this is probably meant when 'gold bows' are spoken of by later works, although among metallic arms. Not only was the bow painted many colors (i. 225. 8, 9), but it was ornamented with all sorts of gold figures, 'drops of gold,' insects, elephants, etc., distributed (*vibhaktāḥ*) upon its surface; representations also of the heavenly bodies are to be found upon it; and even gems of value were set in the wood.* The range of the bow (*bāṇagocara; dhanu-antara* is a technical measurement)† is not described as very great, but the force of the shot is represented as terrific. It is difficult to say whether the many stories of heroes slaying elephants and horses with an arrow apiece, overturning chariots, and transfixing armed knights, are all due to poetic exaggeration, or may be based upon relatively good shooting power. Reading as from the point of view of the later writers' knowledge, we should not be inclined to acknowledge any great dexterity in the use of the weapon. The knights are portrayed as wonderful in the strength and rapidity of their shots; but their shooting except for this is rather ineffectual. Their aim was apparently less good than their quickness in reshooting, although a few cases of good shots are mentioned, and the practice of amusing one's self by shooting into the foe's open wounds is largely indulged in by the heroes, and argues well for their skill. But had they really had any great expertness, they would not have wasted so many arrows before killing each other, in the single duels; for, in

---

the ordinary use *tāv anye dhanuṣī sajje kṛtvā çatrubhayaṁkare*, vii. 170. 43; and, for illustrations of the above uses, see P. W. s. *sajja*, and compare vi. 79. 9; 74. 1; 101. 42; 109. 13; 81. 38; vii. 16. 36; 127. 28; 145. 51; 183. 51. In vii. 2. 23–29 (warrior well described) we find *cāpāni* and *jyāḥ saṁnahanopapannāḥ*, of the different string-strands. Compare also vii. 191. 3, *dhanur jāitram ādāya jaladaniḥsvanaṁ dṛḍhajyam*, etc. *Adhijya* is not often used. An instance is viii. 20. 25: *dhanur athā 'dhijyaṁ kṛtvā*. The setting on of the arrow is *saṁdhāna*. The bow is always unstrung when not in use. The technical use in R. seems to be about the same as in Mbh. Compare R. i. 77. 38, *saṁdhāya sa çaraṁ cāpaṁ vicakarṣa . . vikṛṣya . . tad dhanuḥ saçaram* (analogy with *sajjaṁ dhanuḥ*, compare ib. *vijya*). *Sajjīkuru ratham* (xiii. 53. 30) shows further extension, also used of other objects: compare *sajjay* and *sajjībhū*.

* In vi. 100. 13, and often, we find the expression 'bow with a golden back' (*hemapṛṣṭhaṁ dhanuḥ*), while the animal-ornamentation is described, e. g. in iv. 42. 1 ff., as if figures were placed at equal intervals, the 'drops' (*bindavaḥ*) being the simplest form. A white bow ornamented with the figures of five leopards is here mentioned. Gems on the bows (as on most of the weapons of the knights) are common: compare vii. 168. 11.

† Compare *dhanuḥ* in *dhanuḥçataparīṇāhaḥ*, R. vi. 44. 36, etc.

spite of 'all-protecting armor,' several vital points were exposed, and we often read of one knight wounding another with several successive arrows, yet doing no serious damage.*

This brings us to the point of regarding the skill most praised in handling the bow. We find it is the 'quickness and lightness' that the great heroes of the bow are famous for (not sureness), and that the quickness consists in the ability to discharge several arrows at once, as the Hindu says: that is, perhaps, an apparently unintermitted discharge, owing to the quickness of stringing. Thus, for instance, the Hindu conception of the last quotation would be a simultaneous shooting of three arrows. The fiction is carried further. Five hundred arrows are sometimes shot 'in a twinkling,' or expressly 'with one movement.' Thence the common formula describing a fierce fight: 'the sky became clouded with the arrows' of two contestants. A technical term, *hastavāpa*, 'hand-throw,' was used to characterize this art. The weakness of the special shot was doubtless due to practicing this general discharge of arrows. Wonderful marksmanship, as we understand it, seems to belong to the accretionary legends of the Pāndus, as in the tournament, the description of the *svayaṁvara*, the unlucky rival of Droṇa, etc. (see below, on Science of the Bow.)†

The noise of the bow and twang of the string are objects of the poet's attention; and a favorite scene in the story is the motionless admiration of a whole army gazing upon two heroes engaged in a bow-duel. We notice in such duels that, though the bow is beloved and has a pet name, yet it is often rejected in mid-fight; so that we must suppose the war-car furnished with many bows.‡ The bow itself is often chopped in two with arrows. A single arrow may be driven with force enough to go through a man's head and come out, falling to earth behind him.*

---

* Compare viii. 51. 36, *karṇaḥ . . . bhīmasenaṁ tribhiḥ çarāiḥ, ākarṇamūlaṁ vivyādha dṛḍham āyamya kārmukam*, etc. Here the bow is drawn as hard as possible, and three arrows pierce the foe, but no great harm is done.

† *hastavāpa* in v. 23, 22 (C. 706, *cāpa*) denotes an output of sixty one arrows; but five hundred at once is mentioned in v. 60. 16, and again in v. 90. 29 (*kṣipaty ekena vegena pañca bāṇaçatāni*). As an example of the sky becoming clouded with arrows we may take vii. 139. 45. Arjuna is especially famous for *lāghava* and *sāuṣṭhava*, no one excelling him in this 'lightness and quickness,' whether using *kṣura*, *bhalla*, *nārāca*, or *vipāṭha* (different arrows), i. 139. 6–7: compare ix. 22. 16, etc. The 'well-governed arrow' of viii. 83. 39 may be of aim, but is more likely of force—unless, for *suyantritaḥ*, we read with P.W. *supattritaḥ*.

‡ The dual of bow may imply simply the double bow: that, is with two curves. We find this e. g. R. ii. 106. 11, *kuru sajje ca dhanuṣī kavacaṁ dhārayasva ca*.

The 'law' of the warrior commands that the archer shall attack only the archer. This law is a fiction. Nothing is more common than for a knight first to slay his foe's helpless charioteer and then his proper antagonist. With the fall of the driver the horses usually become unmanageable and flee. 'With arrows drawn to the ear the knight slew the charioteer,' after which the horses galloped away with the empty car.†

2. The quiver. We have several names for this companion of the bow. The most general is the old *iṣudhi*, 'arrow-holder,' named with *dhanus* and *jyā* in many places, but not particularly described. It is probable that an expert warrior using many arrows had a pair of large quivers, perhaps fastened together. We could thus explain the common dual use of the word.‡ Discarding impossibilities, the quiver appears usually to have held from ten to twenty arrows. It was fastened (*baddha*) on the right of the back. Other terms for the quiver alone are *tūṇa* or *tūṇīra*, while *niṣaṅga*, 'hanger,' may be both sword and quiver. The word *upāsaṅga* also means a quiver, but is applied to the larger arrow-holders fastened to a horse or an elephant, although used also of men.§

---

* The noise of the string and bow: compare vii. 8. 18; 9. 36; 32. 41; 38. 13 (*niṣpeṣaṇa*, *jyāghoṣa*, *jyātalanirghoṣa*, *-svana*). In vi. 53. 10 we find, for instance, the scene alluded to above, the army gazing silently at two archers; and here more than one bow is used. So, after one bow is cut in two (*cāpaṁ dvidhā ciccheda*), we find a second seized (*anyat kārmukam ādāya*, vi. 45. 29). Compare the like scene, *tridhā ciccheda*, follow by *athā 'nyad dhanur ādāya sāyakāṅç ca caturdaça*, vi. 45. 33; or the same in ib. 73. 5; 101. 46; viii. 77. 57 (a new bow and sixteen arrows). The force of the arrow is shown, as said above, by transfixing a body in arms, and reappearing, in vii. 156. 184 ff.; 113. 50.

† vi. 72. 26. Regarding the time a bow lasted, we may assume from their constant destruction that they were unenduring, unless of horn or metal. No positive statement can be made. Arjuna's age rather than his bow's is indicated by iv. 43. 6 ('sixty-five years Arjuna had the bow'), as the latter is divine. (In regard to the age of the Pāndus, compare the curious expression in v. 48. 27, *çiçūn kṛtāstrān açiçuprakāçān* (*draṣṭā*) *pañca çūrān*: relationship more than age is implied).

‡ Singular in viii. 16. 34, etc. Dual in i. 225. 22; v. 60. 12; ix. 62. 9 (*maheṣudhī*), etc., of Arjuna's equipment, and the accompanying piece to his large bow, Gāṇḍiva. Cf. *baddhvā tūṇāu dhanuṣpāṇiḥ* of a hunter, R. ii. 65. 17.

§ Compare viii. 27. 29; vii. 29. 16; ix. 24. 13; vi. 48. 29. The *upāsaṅga* (vi. 106. 22 ff.; vii. 148. 42; viii. 19. 42; 58. 26, etc.), when represented as in the chariot, is probably a receptacle more like a box than a real quiver. The commentator says that the *niṣaṅga* was the quiver of a foot-soldier; the *tuṇīra* was the same, only larger; the *upāsaṅga* was a *tūṇa* 'carried by horse or elephant:' see below). *Upāsaṅga* is, however (e. g. iv. 42. 6), used of a knight's quiver, 'golden arrows in a golden *upāsaṅga*' (according to N., the feathers are here called hairs, *sāhasrā lomavāhinaḥ*). The chariot-quivers in the Rāmāyaṇa may be *tūṇa*, of which thirty-two in one car are casually mentioned in R. vi. 51. 18. So plural *tūṇīrāḥ*, vii. 29. 16.

The *kalāpa* is the quiver with its arrows, one word comprising both, and often antithetical to the bow (*kalāpāni dhanūṅṣi ca*). The ornamentation of the quiver appears to have been, as in the case of the bow, by raised figures of animals. How it was made we are not informed.*

3. The arrows. The Epic describes arrows of two chief sorts, *vāiṇava*, 'made of reeds,' and *āyasa*, 'made of iron.' Bone arrows appear rarely in late parts. The oldest and commonest names are *iṣu* (ἰός) and *çara* (reed). Like the first in meaning is *astra*, 'missile,' united with it in *iṣvastra*, the bow, and in the expression *kṛtāstra*, which, like *dhanurdhara*, denotes a fine archer, and is an honorary title of a good knight. Like the second in meaning, but of later use, is *bāṇa*, a reed, but employed also of iron arrows; while the very common *çalya* means the arrow-point, and thence the arrow as a whole.† Beside these we find *bhalla* and *pradara*. the latter rare, and meaning literally a 'splitter;'‡ the former common. The arrow of iron was usually termed *nārāca*. Other less common forms are discussed below.

In regard to the employment of the arrows there is little to be learned, in spite of the long descriptions in the Epic. As said above, they were used to embarrass or slay the foe more by numbers than by the skilful use of one. Nothing is more common than an incredible number of arrows flying across the field between two champions; and a 'rain of arrows' or 'flood of arrows,' forming a 'network' of darts, ensues whenever two heroes contend.§

The arrows generally used were, according to indefinite but frequent descriptions, large, long, heavy, sharp, strong, able to pierce armor, capable of slaying elephants, horses, etc. But we find, besides these long (reed) arrows and heavy (iron) arrows, an arrow 'one span long' made of reed, meant for fighting at close quarters, where it could be more quickly 'put to' and discharged.*

---

* Compare *pañcaçārdūlalakṣaṇaḥ kalāpaḥ*, iv. 43. 15 (compare ib. 42. 8, *kalāpacāpa!* read *tūṇa ?*). The comparison in iv. 45. 7 shows us nothing (the commentator adds *niṣaṅga*).

† *Astra* and *iṣu* are each etymologically merely a *missile telum*. *Sāyaka*. arrow or dart, conveys the same idea. *Iṣvastra* occurs in the pseudo-Epic and Droṇa (p. 169), but is not a battle-word. Late also is *kāṇḍa*, 'joint,' in the sense of arrow. Compare *tatre 'ṣvastram akarot*, xii. 2. 18; *saviṣaṁ kāṇḍam ādāya mṛgayāmāsa vāi mṛgam*. xiii. 5. 3. From *iṣ* we have also *iṣīkā*, probably merely a reed magically used, not strictly an arrow; while the root of *astra* gives us further *prāsa*, 'a projectile,' also a common synonym of any arrow. Compounds of these words are *iṣukāra*, *iṣvāsa*, and *upāstra*. all rare words, the arrow-maker, the arrow-thrower, the little arrow (?).

‡ Compare viii. 76. 16, *nārācānāṁ dve sahasre ca vīra trīṇy eva ca pradarāṇām*.

§ Compare vii. 19. 17, 18, *çaravarṣa*, *çaravṛṣṭi*, *çarajāla*: vii. 160. 44, *bāṇāugha*. The war-cars are often lost to sight in these rains. Hence *çalabhāḥ* as epithet and comparison, thick as flying locusts, iv. 53. 20, etc.

The normal length of the arrow was that of the axle of the war car. Bound with sinews (*snāyu*), and well feathered, it has a 'terrible end,' whether made of reed and tipped with steel or wholly of metal. In the reed the epithet 'well-jointed' (*suparvan*) points to the joints of the reeds being well smoothed. Three joints are recommended. The feathers used were of various kinds; hawks, flamingos, and herons furnish the sorts most used, various birds being sometimes represented in the feathering of one arrow.†

The sharpness of the arrow is naturally often alluded to, the point (*mukha*, *vaktra*, *agra*) and edges (*dhārā*) being 'sharp as flame,' or 'sharp as a hair,' for they were 'whetted on stone.'‡

---

* *vāitastikā nāma çarāḥ*, used as described in vii. 191. 42: compare id. ib. 122. 60; R. vi. 49. 49. The 'putting to' or 'setting on' of any arrow is (*yoga*, 'fastening,' or, more commonly) *nidhāna* and *saṁdhāna*. Compare *saṁdhiteṣavaḥ*, 'with arrows fitted to the bow,' i. 132. 69; and here, too, *lakṣya* (cf. *lakṣa*) as the target (68); *çakyaṁ veddhuṁ lakṣyam* (77; but *samāhitāḥ çarāḥ* are arrows shot all at once and falling together). *Astrayoga*, in iv. 2. 20, etc., is the art of shooting.

† Later authorities specify three cubits as the arrow's length (Nītip., etc.). Egerton says the usual length is two and a half to three feet (Handbook of Indian Arms, reviewed in Ind. Ant. 1886, p. 24 ff. I have not seen the work itself). The Epic gives the axle of the war-car as the norm: an item that might determine the size of the chariot, if one could trust the correctness of the later writers as authority for the Epic; this, however, we are not entitled to do. Compare *rathākṣamātrāir iṣubhiḥ*, vii. 166. 18; 175. 19. The *snāyu* fastened the arrow-head to the shaft. Compare *pītāḥ . . snāyunaddhāḥ suparvāṇaḥ pṛthavo dīrghagāminaḥ, vāiṇavāç cā 'yasāç co 'grāḥ* . . etc., in vii. 99. 7 (where the commentator explains *sūkṣmacarmāgrāḥ*): a description comprising about all that we can learn of the arrow barring the feathers.. For the *parvan*, compare *saṁnataparvabhiḥ*, iv. 35. 15; vi. 112. 26; and *nataparvan*, itself the arrow, vi. 117. 44; vii. 129. 27. The favorite feathers seem to have been long hawks' feathers, with which the arrows are 'dressed' (compare *vāsa*; *kaṅka-*, *barhiṇa-*, *dīrgha-*, and *çukapatrābhāiḥ pūrvāir ardhāiḥ suvāsasaḥ, uttarāir āyasāiḥ pītāir hemapuṅkhāiḥ çilāçitāiḥ*, iv. 42. 10). With *gārdhrapatra* (vii. 119. 41) and *kaṅkapatra* (*hṛdi vivyādha saṁkruddhaḥ kaṅkapatraparicchadāiḥ . . çarāiḥ*, vi. 101. 41) compare vii. 125. 28 and 29, *gārdhrapatra*, and *kaṅkabarhiṇavājitāiḥ sāyakāiḥ*; also ix. 28. 5, the same, followed by *çilādhāutāiḥ*. In iv. 43. 18, *triparvāṇaḥ*.

‡ Compare *çitāir agniçikhākārāiḥ*, vii. 104. 32; and *çilāçita*, vi. 110. 38, applied to an arrow. *Lomavāhin*, etc., 'sharp as a hair,' is common, e. g. iv. 63. 6 (but compare N. in note above). It is not strange that this edge can cut the bow of an adversary (e. g. vi. 112. 26), for the head seems not to be a point so much as a blade. With *çilāçita* compare the frequent epithet *çilīmukha*, used as name of the arrow in general, and especially applied to iron arrows (*çilīmukhāiḥ . . bāṇāir niçitāiḥ . . āyasāiḥ*, vi. 114. 35; 111. 35; 113. 40; *svarṇapuṅkhāṅ chilīmukhāṅ chilāçitāṅç cikṣepa*, viii. 28. 4. This epithet is also applied to the sword (see below)

The other end of the arrow is adorned with what is often called the 'golden' *puṅkha*. When applied to a 'knife arrow,' we find the *puṅkha* of silver. To drive the arrow up to this part was a special feat. The *puṅkha*, then, was a metal end attached to the main shaft, and was probably added for the purpose of making a securer notch (the notch itself being called *kuḍmala*), and opposed to *çṛṅga*, the sharp end (viii. 34. 18–19): a hold alike for string and feathers. Oiled arrows are often referred to, and fire may have been applied to them thus oiled, as we find them spoken of independently as 'glowing;' but I am inclined to think that, if arrows really lighted had been used, more than this epithet would remain to prove it; for the 'glowing,' like the 'flame,' of an arrow is poetical for heat, and probably refers only to its sharpness* and its fiery touch; and the word is used where no fire is necessarily imaginable (as of a sword), and where none is certainly discoverable. Moreover, these 'glowing arrows' never kindle wood. From the effect, then, or lack of effect, I think it doubtful if fire was used; though the mention of 'ignited' arrows in Manu may induce some to interpret *dīpta* as really enkindled.† The question whether poisoned arrows were used in war has been, I think, unsatisfactorily answered. Wilson says that (bamboo or wood) arrows were not poisoned except in the chase. This is one of those statements, based on a study of ideals, that must be modified by facts. The last part is not wrong; in the chase poisoned arrows are alluded to in the pseudo-Epic quotation given above, where we read of hunting with 'poisoned arrows'; yet it is mentioned elswhere that hunting was done with 'pure' (i. e. unpoisoned) arrows, showing such sometimes to have been the case.‡ But as to war, the law forbidding poisoned arrows, and the Epic's special statement that one 'honorable fight' took place where 'poison' was not used, show that *lipta* or poisoned arrows were generally employed.* It is also possible that the common epithet 'resembling a snake' may refer to the poison, though perhaps better understood of the sharp bite, the whizzing sound, and the darting motion.†

---

* Compare Antig. 1085, *ἀφῆκα . . καρδίας τοξεύματα . . τῶν σὺ θάλπος οὐχ ὑπεκδραμεῖ.*

† *tāiladhāuta* (vii. 139. 2), of arrows, properly 'dipped in sesame oil.' Fire like arrows are mentioned vii. 120. 19; so *çarā dīptāḥ*, iii. 23. 3. The oil was probably for loss of friction, used of *bhalla* in general, viii. 25. 9 (*dhāv*, 'wash in oil,' v. 19. 3 ff.). In ix. 28. 5, *çilādhāutaḥ* (*çaraḥ*) is 'polished by stone.' In Manu, however, *agnijvalitatejana*, 'with the point ignited,' vii. 90, may mean 'with sharpness of fire,' used figuratively, but from the context seems literal. That the 'glowing' often means merely sharpness may be shown by such examples as viii. 90. 68 (note also *avakraga*); R. vi. 51. 73, *niçitam bāṇaṁ jvalantam iva tejasā . . ādāya dhanuḥçreṣṭhe yojayāmāsa*. Compare in the following vs. 87: *jagrāha ca çaraṁ tīkṣṇaṁ tam astreṇa ca saṁdadhe. āgneyena tato 'streṇa yojayāmāsa sāyakaṁ, sa jajvāla mahābāṇaḥ.* Compare, too, R. vi. 69. 3 ff.: 'the sharp feather-clothed arrows' are *çikhisaṁsparçāḥ*. In R. vi. 54. 49, all sorts of weapons are *dīpta*, i. e. bright or sharp: compare ib. 59, *pradīptāsyāḥ . . anye*, of men; and R. vi. 58. 44, *dṛṣṭvā çūlaṁ jvalantam*.

‡ Wilson, iv. 355 ff. Compare iii. 36. 45, *caranto mṛgayāṁ nityaṁ çuddhāir bāṇāir mṛgārthinaḥ* (perhaps 'bright'). Poisoned arrows for

More than this in regard to the arrows used in the Epic must be confined to the special uses of the different sorts, though we are here chiefly driven to the interpretation of the name for the kind, and the special peculiarities of each mentioned. For, as a general thing, the arrows are alluded to in the mass, and only here and there do we find particular descriptions. The meagre accounts show us, however, many more names than we can interpret. Probably several of these are merely epithets applicable to different sorts: thus, the *gokarṇa*, 'cow-ear,' may be of any material, and the gold tips of the 'reed' may be equally applicable to the horn-arrow. I shall, then, only attempt to gather what I have noted of each, without believing that the individual description should be confined to the arrow described. Only important is the construction of the possible Hindu arrow, though I regret not finding more details.

Bhīma's favorite arrow was the 'crescent-head,' with which one can cut a head from a body, or divide a bow in two. This, the 'very sharp' *ardhacandra*, is frequently named with others, the 'broad,' *añjalika*, the *vatsadanta*, *bhalla*, etc. (vi. 92. 33; 94. 3; vii. 21. 21; 115. 27). The *vatsadanta* is named about as often as the *ardhacandra*. It is, from its name, a calf's-tooth-shaped arrow, and from the descriptions is particularly sharp. One wards off an onrushing foe with it (vii. 25. 40). It is classed with the little known 'broad *vipāṭha*' (iv. 42. 7; vii. 38. 23), and its action is, perhaps, as well as anywhere, thus exhibited: 'He laid the tooth-shaped arrow on the string

---

the chase are assumed in later works. Compare, too, on this point N.'s and Medinī's interpretation of *gṛñjanam* (on *gṛñjanakādayaḥ*, xiii. 91. 39), either as *viṣadigdhaçastrahatapaçumāñsam* or as *viṣadigdhapaçormāñsam*.

* M. vii. 90, *digdha*; Mbh. vii. 189. 11 ff., *lipta*. Compare xii. 95. 11, *iṣur lipto na karṇī syāt*.

† *prāmuñcat puṅkhasaṁyuktāñ charān āçīviṣopamān*, vi. 74. 2. Of warrior or of arrow, iii. 33. 86, 87; 40. 12; of arrow, iv. 59. 13 (*çarāiḥ āçīviṣākārāir jvaladbkir iva pannagāiḥ*): compare ib. 64. 6, and viii. 90. 57 (*nārācam āçīviṣatulyavegam utsasarja*). R. vi. 68. 5, *saṁdhāya çarān āçīviṣopamān mumoca niçitān . . sarpāñ iva mahāviṣān*. Also R. ii. 66. 1, *çaram uddhṛtya dīptam āçīviṣopamam*. There is here no thought of fire. We may add on *dīpta* the application in R. to the moon, a car being compared to the moon in glory which is *dīpta*, i. e. brilliant—or, as is apologetically added, *prajvalan* (*iva*) *çriyā*, as if on fire with beauty,' R. vi. 31. 29-30.

—swift as the wind it was—he drew it back until it touched his ear, and Sātyaki he pierced upon the belly. Right through the body's guard it cut, and through the body—the arrow with its feathers and its metal butt—and dripping with blood it entered the earth' (vii. 113. 49 ff.).

The *kṣurapra* is a knife-shaped arrow: that is, with a blade-head; and, like all these broad arrows, it cuts, if need be, a head from a body. It is spoken of as excessively sharp, and seems to have the legally forbidden 'ears,' or prongs bending back on the fish-hook plan.* We have in Droṇa's leadership a list of arrows comprising *nārāca*, *vatsadanta*, *bhalla*, *añjalika*, *kṣurapra*, *ardhacandra*; and again a 'half-*nārāca*,' with *nārācas* of iron.† The *nārāca* here mentioned is of iron, and is, according to another passage in the pseudo-Epic (xiii. 104. 34), distinct from the *nālīka* (where we also find the *karṇin* or 'be-eared' arrow differentiated from the *nālīka*). The expression *kṣudranārāca* is here employed, literally 'small.' We find an antithesis between these again expressed in the battle-scenes, and in the Rāmāyaṇa the *nālīka* and (*bahu-*)*nārāca* are differentiated as if dissimilar.‡

The *nārāca* has a gilded or silvered point, and is perhaps the special name for the *bāṇā āyasāḥ*, or iron shafts, mentioned above. It is generally defined as wholly of iron, but is described as 'feathered' (iv. 42.6). The *nālīka*, of reed nominally, may perhaps also have been of metal, as this is the name in modern literature of the iron musket.§ The sharpness of the *nārāca*, its smallness compared with the reed, its gold or silver point and gold *puṅkha*, are the main characteristics dwelt upon in this weapon.‖

Respecting the word *sāyaka*, although literally merely a projectile, it appears to be in most cases confined to the sense of arrow. But the same word is used of a sword, and the instrument is now and then spoken of as flung.[*]

---

* Compare viii. 25. 3, *kṣurapreṇa dhanuç chittvā tāḍayāmāsa karṇinā; sutīkṣṇena*, ib. 36. Also vii. 21. 28 (*kāyāt . . . apāharac chiraḥ*); 28. 7; vi. 113. 32, 41.

† vii. 187. 45; *ardhanārūca*, ii. 51. 35, like *ardhāsi*, 'short sword.' The first list in vii. 115. 27–28.

‡ Compare the lists above with R. vi. 20. 26 (*et circa*): R. iii. 34. 10, *nālīkanārācāis tīkṣṇāgrāiç ca vikarṇibhiḥ*.

§ *kaladhāutāgra*, of *nārāca*, iv. 61. 35. The same in *jāmbūnadāgra* of the *bāṇa*, iv. 65. 3 (*jāmbūnadapuṅkhacitra*, ib. 4). For the *nālīka* or *ṅalika* as musket we must turn to wholly modern compositions, the war-manuals published by Oppert (which are veiled with old verses taken from the Epic and law, more or less distorted). *Āiṣīka* of *astra* (compare the *āiṣīkam parva* in the Sāuptika) tells us nothing. These special names may all be regarded as species of the general *sāyaka*, most commonly used in such expressions as 'the terrible arrows,' without nearer explanation: as in viii. 37. 28; iii. 23. 3, etc.

‖ Compare vi. 111. 46; ib. 108. 29, and often, without description.

Out of the various lists of arrows which are mentioned as encumbering the ground with other arms,[†] we may occasionally find descriptive epithets applied to names that are themselves nothing more than this. Thus *mārgaṇa* is defined as an arrow, and we may say that it is characterized as a 'sharp' arrow;[‡] but the information must simply be referred to the arrow in general; for *mārgaṇa* itself is only an epithet of the 'eager' arrow. Our knowledge, then, except in a few cases, is not increased by such descriptions. Names and names only are the *pṛṣatka* and *añjalika*, often mentioned as (epithet of) arrows, meaning apparently in one case that the arrow is speckled, in the other that it is barbed. *Vipāṭha* seems also to be a general term for arrows; but further than being broad, of iron, and yellow, i. e. gilded, the arrows thus named bear only universal characteristics. A further universal epithet of any arrow, often used as name, is 'the feathered one' (*pattrin*).

The same passage containing the description of *vipāṭha* speaks of 'boar-ear' arrows: that is, arrows forbidden by the law-books, with barbs at the heads, but often spoken of in the Epic.[§]

I referred above to the poisoned arrows spoken of by the poet in one scene as discarded in honorable fight. But the list of dishonorable weapons here alluded to shows us many that must have been in use, though legally (perhaps later) forbidden. The 'ear arrows,' poisoned arrows, goat-horn arrows, needle-shaped arrows, arrows of monkey-bone, of cow-bone, and of elephant-bone; arrows so fractured as to break in the flesh; 'rotten' arrows; and crooked arrows; while the *nālīka* is also, strange to say, here spoken of with the implication of baseness in its use, which the commentator explains by defining *nālīka* as an arrow that enters breaking in the flesh, and cannot be withdrawn on account of its small size.[‖] The Rā-

---

[*] For the arrow-sense, compare vii. 38. 6; vi. 117. 42 (*ayomukha*). As sword, compare *vāiyāghrakoçe nihitah*, iv. 42. 11-12, ornamented with bells, and called *çilīpṛṣṭha, çilīmukha*: that is, the general *sāyaka* includes even the *khaḍga*. In vii. 25. 57-58, the *sāyaka* is a general term for anything thrown.

[†] Such lists as occur in v. 152. 15 ff.; 155. 3 ff.; vii. 25. 57 ff.; 178. 23 ff., etc.

[‡] vi. 118. 48; vii. 145. 58, *tīkṣṇa*.

[§] *varāhakarṇavyāmiçrāḥ çarāḥ*, iv. 42. 8.

[‖] *karṇī, nālīkaḥ, liptaḥ* (*viṣeṇe 'ti çeṣaḥ*), *bastikaḥ* (or *bastakaḥ*), *sūcī, kapiçaḥ, gavāsthiḥ, gajāsthijaḥ, saṁçliṣṭaḥ, pūtiḥ, jihmagaḥ* are the epithets applied to the condemned arrows; while it is added that the approved weapons of all were 'straight' and 'pure' (*ṛjūny eva viçuddhāni çastrāṇi*), vii. 189. 11 ff. *Bastika* or *vastika* is read and explained by N. very artificially, as a loose-headed arrow shot into the bladder (*vasti*);

māyana shows here, as it generally does in the battle-descriptions, thoroughly Epic usage.[*]

We must suppose either that the barbed, poisoned, torturing arrow scorned in the law code of Manu and late Epic was a new invention of that period, or else that it was used from ancient times, and gradually began to be inveighed against by the popular law (Manu) and Epic, as too cruel for a more advanced age. The latter seems more reasonable.

Next to the bow and arrow in importance are the club, sword, and spear. I shall examine these separately.

2. The club. This weapon appears to be more used than the sword. But its more primitive character is further shown by the fact that some heroes hold to the club as their favorite weapon, and none do so in the case of the sword. Bhīma, Çalya, etc., are particularly famed as club-men. No one is noted especially for sword-skill. But usually both of these are merely reserve-weapons. As much skill is required in club-fighting as in bow-fighting. Set duels of club-men are often described, but the use of the sword is more adventitious. If the hero goes into battle at the beginning of the day, his chariot contains swords and clubs as well as bows; but no hero, discarding the bow, enters battle with the sword as his first weapon, whereas we find this occurring in the case of the club. Thus Bhīma, virtually on that day the leader, advances at the beginning of one day's battle at the head of the army armed with the club as the main weapon.[†] When ordinary combatants find that their arrows fail to kill the adversary, they usually leap down and rush at each other, not with swords, but with clubs. It is the first weapon in general esteem next to the bow.

Like the bow, the favorite club bears a pet name, as in the case of Krishna's *kāumodakī*.[‡]

---

but he mentions *bastaka* as another reading. Probably, comparing the following, this is correct, and the arrow is one with a head shaped like a goat's horn. The 'needle' arrow has a great many barbs, not two alone, like that called 'be-eared.' The 'monkey' arrow may be of bone or of iron (from its color), according to N.; the latter is preferred by Medinī. These bone arrows are explained by the commentators as poisoned. The three constant debts of the Hindu are in the Rāmāyaṇa temporarily increased by one through poetic application of this common figure: 'debtless in respect of arrows and bow shall I be to-day in battle,' says Bhārata's foe (*çarāṇāṁ dhanuṣaç cā 'ham anṛṇo 'dya mahāraṇe*), R. ii. 106. 28.

[*] E. g. *kṣurārddhacandropamakarṇibhallāiḥ çarāṅç cicchedd*, R. vi. 36. 77: cf. ib. 49. 49, etc.

[†] vi. 19. 32.

[‡] One example suffices, but names will be found generally for favorite weapons. In Krishna's case, the discus is the pet weapon, but the club is nicknamed *kāumodakī nāmnā gadā*, i. 225. 28 (the *vajranābhaç cakraḥ* in 22).

The best description of the use of the club is given in the account of battle between Duryodhana and Bhīma, where the club is used with tricks and 'circles' of passes to such an extent that it is plain great skill was required (ix. 55 ff; 57. 16 ff.). In fact, it seems as if the highest skill and greatest amount of practice was spent on the management of the war-car and the club; the bow being ordinarily used, as said above, with more attention to speed than to nicety of aim (although *bāṇavedha*, or exact aiming, is spoken of as an object of endeavor). This club-fight quotes the law that 'no Āryan strikes below the navel' (see above, p. 233); the event shows that the Pāndu hero managed by a clever turn to break both the thighs of his adversary; but he is greatly blamed for the act.

The club is called by several names, most commonly *musala* ('pestle') and *gadā*. Judging from here and there, a distinction seems possibly to have existed between these two forms of clubs (cf. vii. 25. 58–59), but what the difference is cannot be determined from the Epic. The *pināka* also seems to be a general term for the club, but is usually confined to the weapon of the deity, and may mean a bow, as it is later identified with the trident-spit, *çūla*. But beside these we often find *parigha*, ēxplained by modern works as a catapult, but in the Epic an iron-bound club flung with the hand. In the descriptions of the club we find much that repeats the ornamentation of the bow, with some added particulars. Its general form seems to have been that of a tapering post, girded with iron spikes, and hence heavy and sharp, sometimes plated with gold, or, according to the extravagance of the poet's fancy, bejeweled. For the simple truth of the primitive club, we may subtract the glitter, and leave an iron pillar, cruelly made terrible with sharp corners and inserted spikes. It was carried upon the shoulder, and appears in this form to have been used only by the well-born. Probably its great size and weight prevented its popularity as much as anything; Bhīma, its greatest lover, being at the same time the strongest of the Pāndus. The descriptions of this weapon are generally quite uniform, and amount to a heavy inlaid gold-plated sharp-cornered club of iron girded with spikes.*

---

* The following passages corroborate this: *kāñcanāṅgadabhūṣaṇā* (*gadā*) *adrisāramayī gurvī*, ix. 32. 37; *skandhe kṛtvā 'yasīṁ gadām*, ib. 38 (R. vi. 55. 12, *gadā sarvāyasī*); *çāikyā 'yasī gadā jātarūpapariṣkṛtā*, ib. 39; *çāikyā gadāḥ*, vii. 163. 21; *gadāḥ . . vimalāiḥ paṭṭāiḥ pinaddhāḥ svarṇabhūṣitāiḥ*, vi. 87. 29; the gilded knobs (*samutsedha*) are particularly referred to, iii. 271. 4; *gadā bahukaṇṭakā*, R. vi. 28. 36. The number of edges is six or eight (*ṣaḍasri, aṣṭāsri*), and the club as a whole is often compared either to the *daṇḍa* of Yama, or to the *açani* of Indra (v. 51. 8; ix. 55. 18, 25 to end; in v. 51. 24, 28 the iron club is damas-

Besides the above-mentioned ornamentation, we find the club decorated with bells, of which a hundred are mentioned.[*] The simple staff or cudgel is used as a club-weapon. Sometimes it is of iron, sometimes of wood, but generally defined as iron. Several weapons not more nearly defined appear to belong here, as battle-clubs.[†] To prepare for a club-fight, one binds up the hair, and fastens on a breastplate and helmet (ix. 32. 60 ff.). The conflict could not take place except on the ground; the cars are sometimes unexpectedly left, but often by mutual agreement, to fight with the club.[‡]

The following scene (vii. 15) will illustrate the method of fighting as generally described. Çalya and Bhīma, both celebrated for their skill, face each other. 'No other than Çalya can withstand the sweep of Bhīma's club; and who other than Bhīma can support that of Çalya's? Bound about with golden

---

cened, four *kiṣku* long, with fair sides, six-cornered (but in ib. 24 'without ears,' and described as a *çataghnī* of heavy iron: see below). The length of a heavy club flung at the foe is represented as four *kiṣkus* also in vii. 134. 10, as above, adorned with gold *aṅgada*. According to i. 19. 17; vii. 25. 58; 157. 9; 162. 27; 178. 12, 22, the *parigha* is nothing but an iron club thrown by the bearer. It is described here as 'sharp and horrible,' and is itself discharged at the head of the foe (*mumoca*, vii. 157. 9). There is no difference as to size perceptible between the kinds, for the *parigha* is large, but (vii. 178. 12) *atikāya*, or enormous, only as a demon's weapon. But the iron gold-bound *musala* seems smaller perhaps in ix. 14. 29–30 (*ayasmayam musalaṁ cikṣepa parighopamam*), since the larger is that naturally used as comparison. Compare the demons' *bahuvyāmāḥ parighāḥ* in R. vi. 44. 34 (with simple *gadāḥ* and *musalāni*). In this passage *sālaskandha* is also (a beam used as) a club. It is possible that, in vi. 117. 28, *hematālena mahatā bhīṣmas tiṣṭhati pālayan* may refer to the size of Bhīshma's club, but probably his signum is meant.

[*] vii. 178. 14 (*çataghaṇṭā*). In this case also the weapon is 'like fire,' probably from its bite, or its gems' glitter. Compare the 'glowing clubs,' *gadāḥ pradīptāḥ*, of R. vi. 17. 27. So the gold-plating presumably induces the comparison with Indra's *açani* (*açanīprakhyā gadā*, vii. 15. 6, etc.), quite as much as size or force.

[†] Thus, v. 51. 22; vii. 22. 22, *āyasena daṇḍena* (with other arms). Even *kaḍaṅgara* is interpreted as a *daṇḍa*, and seems to be a missile (vii. 25. 58; omitted in C.). Perhaps the unknown weapon called *kalāṅgala* (iii. 15. 7) is the same as *kaḍaṅgara*. *Laguḍa*, explained by Pischel as a Prakrit word (Bezz. B. iii.), and rendered by *ayoghana*, appears to be an iron club. *Sthūṇa* is an iron pillar (*kārṣṇāyasī*), vii. 156. 142, and is flung like other clubs.

[‡] This jumping out of the car to fling something (a *rathacakra*, for instance) is common, and is the regular procedure when the horses are slain. The hero then drops the bow and rushes out with the club. Compare vi. 53. 28, *sa cchinnadhanvā viratho hatāçvo hatasārathiḥ, gadāpāṇir avārohat khyāpayan pāuruṣam mahat*; the same in vii. 99. 26; and similar is ix. 11. 41 ff. Compare vii. 167. 8, where one is exposed and in danger from an unexpected assault of this sort. Bhīma is particularly fond of rushing out in this way, viii. 93. 23 ff. Less often the sword is so used, as in viii. 13. 29 (*virathāu asiyuddhāya samājagmatur āhave*). The club is often hurled at the foe along with other common missiles: and e. g. in vi. 48. 92 it is flung at a war-car.

plates (or thongs, *paṭṭāiḥ*) shone Bhīma's club, and Çalya's. Like a flash of lightning gleamed each club as the two warriors circled and manœuvred; for like two circling bellowing steers they rushed about each other. Vainly they stood and fought, while fire came from out their clashing clubs, but neither yielded. Then back they stepped, retreating each eight paces, and like two angry elephants again charged on each other with their mighty iron staves; that blow bore neither, and down to earth fell each; till Çalya's friend rushed up to aid, and the fight of the two was ended.'*

3. The sword. The Epic age seems to represent the epoch where the bow is yielding to the sword. The latter is known earlier; it is used, but not so much, like the club, as a secondary weapon. But in the pseudo-Epic the sword has become the emblem of authority. Justice is now incorporated in the sword (*asi*). This weapon in the final Epic reigns supreme; the bow is an instrument more of the chase than of the battle. In like manner, in the earlier accounts of divine weapons bestowed upon man, the bow is the chief gift; in the later Epic and last interpolations, the deity's gift is a sword. Indra presents Arjuna with the bow Gāṇḍīva; Çiva presents him with the sword Pāçupata. Again, the bow is the first aggressive, the sword the defensive, or secondary aggressive weapon.

The sword, it is further worth noting, is often no more an implement of hand dexterity than a missile, to be cast like a javelin.† The former use occurs often, but the latter is still more common. Thus, we have seen above that it is synonymous with

---

* In this scene each hero has a *gadā*. The circles and manœuvres are, as in the war-cars, called so technically. Compare 14, 15, *mārgān maṇḍalāni ca sarvaço viceratuḥ*; and the expression in i. 69. 23, *gadāmaṇḍalatattvajñaḥ*, 'one well acquainted with the club-circles.' In our passage, verse 28, the *lohadaṇḍa*, 'iron staff,' is the equivalent of *gadā*. The stepping back eight paces for a new charge is regular. Compare ix. 12. 20, where the same occurs. The four methods of club-fight spoken of in i. 68. 12–13 (*catuṣpathagadāyuddhe sarvapraharaṇeṣu ca, nāgapṛṣṭhe 'çvapṛṣṭhe ca babhūva pariniṣṭhitaḥ*) are defined by the commentator as *prakṣepa, vikṣepa, parikṣepa, abhikṣepa*; that is, flinging at the foe from a distance; engaging at the point of the club; revolving it about in the midst of foes; and smiting the foe in front. Of *gadā* as a projectile fired by gun-powder (Nītip.) there is of course no trace; nor of *parigha* as a battering-ram (ib.) requiring many to move it. For *mudgara*, see below. Compare further above, p. 197, note.

† The quotation from the Agni Purāṇa given by Wilson (iv. 291, quoted by Rāj. Mitra, Indo-Ar. i. 297) indicates that the sword was regarded in that work as inferior to the bow. In this case, the sword strictly as a missile must be meant. The form given the sword in the pseudo-Epic cannot be explained simply by regarding it there as a type of Justice. That it is such a type means that the weapon was held in honor. I am inclined to think that the Purāṇa's preference is more formal than real, for the sword is here also the more conspicuous weapon.

*sāyaka*, or rather, regarded as a species of *sāyaka*, the general term for missile, but at the same time is ornamented with bells and set in a tiger-skin sheath. As an illustration of this use, compare the verse: 'he was then overwhelmed by (a number of weapons cast at him, namely), sharp arrows, clubs, pestle-clubs, spears, post-clubs, darts, and swords, all spotless and sharp' (iii. 204. 24).

We might translate *khaḍga* here as scimeter, and add *asi* and *nistriṅça* as other common names of swords, but whether there is a distinction between these is not apparent. The *asi* may be a sabre (often called *mahāsi*, *dīrghāsi*, 'long sword') and *nistriṅça* a short sword, but I find no Epic data for establishing a difference.*

The sword-belt (*mekhalā*) sustained the sheath (*koça*), wherein the sword hung on the left side. The warrior was then one 'whose sword is fastened on,' a common epithet of the knight.†

The sword can scarcely have been so weak that a dart could pierce it, and we have to understand poetic exaggeration, perhaps, when in honor of a knight we are told that he cast the dart *viçikha* so well that it cut a sabre in two.‡ The Epic writers represent the sword and other offensive iron weapons as being a special product of the western countries.§

We find, as observed above, that the sword is secondary to the bow and to the club. Thus, to give one instance, when Dhrishtadyumna's bow and club fail, he uses his sword and shield, decorated with a hundred moons (vii. 191 25). The *asipatha*, or 'path of the sabre,' is often spoken of as the way cut through a crowd by a desperate fighter (compare *rathapatha*). Not much can be learned of the sheath and hilt. The former was of leather,* and called *koça;* the latter is said to be of gold or ivory, and is called *tsaru.*†

---

* *Karavāla* meaning sword (-hilt?) is merely an epithet, 'hand-protector.' *Nistriṅça* is, according to native etymology, a sword less than thirty fingers in length, but is called 'heavy' in iv. 42. 16. *Asi* is rendered sabre by Rāj. Mitra, who compares ἀκινάκης (Indo-Ary. i. 316) and gives some modern illustrations. He compares Bṛh. Saṁh., which (50. 1 ff.), with the Ag. Purāṇa (244. 23), specifies the longest sword (*khaḍga* in both) as fifty digits, the shortest as twenty-five. When *asi* is used as a counter-part to the bow, no special kind seems meant: e. g. R. ii. 107. 3, *kim atra dhanuṣā kāryam asinā vā sacarmaṇā.*

† *te ca baddhatanutrāṇāḥ . . kuçacīriṇo māurvīmekhalino vīrāh*, vii. 17. 23 (where the *mūrva* girdle is used for a religious purpose); *naddhakhaḍga* is synonymous with *naddhanistriṅça*, both apparently used for sword in general. In Indo-Aryans the sword is called *khāṇḍā!*

‡ *viçikhena sutīkṣṇena khaḍgam asya dvidhā 'karot*, vii. 156. 85. The epithet sharp (*tīkṣṇa*) is often applied to the *viçikha* (but cf. P. W.).

§ Thus, in ii. 51. 28, the tributaries give *aparāntasamudbhūtān dīrghāsīn ṛṣṭiçaktiparaçvadhān*, 'long-swords and spears and battle-axes made in the west.'

The sword was ornamented, like the club, with gold drops or other ornaments.‡ The word *dhārā* may be applied to the sharp edge of the sword, or to the point, as in *çaradhārā* like *asidhārā.*§

The dexterity with which the sword is used is extolled (vi. 90. 42), and it could not have been of very great weight, partly because it is used with great quickness (see below), and partly because it is forever breaking in the user's hand.‖ In the following passage, describing the use as a reserve arm, the *nistriñça* is synonymous with the *asi:* 'then these two, being now deprived of their chariots, rushed together for a strife with the sword (*asi*). And they shone as they bore the good swords' (*nistriñça*: viii. 13. 29–30). The description goes on to give the 'circles' and manœuvres employed by the contestants. Similar use as a reserve-arm will be found in other passages. In all, the knight leaves the war-car 'bearing sword and shield.'¶ Such sword-manœuvres are not described in detail, but they are in part mentioned by name, and further explained by the commentator. In one passage twenty-one manœuvres are accredited to one warrior, the technicality indicating lateness.**

An able warrior may advantageously pit a sword against a bow. The man is usually represented as running amuck through the ranks, slashing everything he meets, even to the parts of war-cars. But sometimes a regular duel takes place between the sword-bearer and bow-bearer. Thus, in one passage, Bhīma seizes a sword and a bull's hide shield (*ārṣabhaṁ carma*) decorated with gold stars and crescents, and meets his antagonist who stands 'fingering the bow-string' and at last shoots. But Bhīma cuts the arrow in two with the sword.*

---

* Later of silk, like the silk sheath in Mṛcch. (Indo-Ar. i. 319).

† *dantatsarūn asīn*, ii. 51. 16; *hematsaru* of *nistriñça*, iv. 43. 21. The sheath was of cow-hide, rhinoceros-hide, tiger-skin, etc. In iv. 42. 12 ff. we have an elaborate description of the sword: the *sāyaka*-sword in a tiger-skin sheath; the scimeter, *khaḍga*, in a cow-hide sheath (*gavye*); the *sāyaka* again in a *pāñcanakhe koçe* (sheath made of the skin of a five-clawed animal); and the *nistriñça* with the *sāyaka* in a gold sheath. In regard to the position of the sheath, see below (x. 8. 59), under protective armor.

‡ iv. 42. 16, *hemabindubhir āvṛtaḥ* of *khaḍga;* the general word is *vigraha*.

§ *khaḍgena çitadhāreṇa*, viii. 23. 9. Compare iv. 42. 11.

‖ *bhagnanistriñçaḥ*, vii. 14. 74; the knight thereupon takes to flight.

¶ *khaḍgacarmadhṛt*, vii. 47. 21; compare ib. 48. 35. But *carma* may (pseudo-Epic) be the sheath, as in *nīlacarmāvṛtāiḥ khaḍgāiḥ* (xii. 98. 29), 'swords enveloped in dark leather.'

** Most of them are at once intelligible. Swinging the sword about, or over the foe, guarding by a false movement, approaching, touching, forcing the foe's guard, twisting to one side or the other, retreating, clashing. assault from above, below on an exposed part, flashing quick passes, sheathing—the meaning of the last three movements (*bhāratam, kāuçikam, sātvatam*) depends wholly on the commentator, vii. 191. 37–40: cf. vi. 54. 50. The 'hundred and one flights' of the crows in viii. 41. 25 ff. are in plain mockery of these manœuvres of sword and war-car. The Agni Purāṇa swells the sword-manœuvres to thirty-two (251. 4).

The sword appears to have been worn at all times, as a fully equipped knight is described as 'bearing a breastplate and arrows, and a sword and a bow.'† But while fighting in the car, the swords were very likely hung on the side. In the Rāmāyaṇa (vi. 51. 18), we have a war-car described wherein were thirty-two quivers, many bows and clubs, and two swords, one on each side, with hilts four hands long, themselves ten hands.

In the latest portion of our poem, the pseudo-Epic claims that the bow is the 'first' weapon and the sword 'the foremost.'‡

4. The spear. This weapon in its various subdivisions is one of the most important in Hindu warfare, and deserves a special paragraph, although it does not belong so essentially to a knight's furnishings as do the three arms mentioned above. But if we include together the chariot-spear, the lance, the many undetermined arms that must for lack of finer distinction also be called spears, and finally the javelin, we have a species of arm constantly and very effectively used.

Rājendralāla Mitra has devoted half a page to this weapon, and attempts no distinction or definition (Ind. Ary. i. 312). I am not sure that I can add much to his nothing in the latter point; but although, from the matter drawn upon, liable to force a distinction, I should like to say in advance that the poets often use words synonymously which may strictly have been applied to different objects.

---

* vi. 54. 26 ff. This feat of Bhīma's 'preserved the army;' and characteristic of the naïve account is the added remark, that Bhīma shouted with joy when he had performed the act. Shouting was the constant practice, either for pure joy or to inspire fear. The 'sister of the sword' (*asidhenu*, stiletto) is not worn by Epic kings, as Nītip. enjoins. It belongs to a late age. The *māuṣṭika* (dagger) and *īlī* seem also absent; and I think the *kūṭakhaḍga* (dagger) is peculiar to R. (vi. 80. 4).

† vii. 111. 51: compare R. ii. 49. 5, *tataḥ kalāpāu saṁnahya khaḍgāu baddhvā ca dhanvināu jagmatuḥ.*

‡ Bhīshma, being asked what the best weapon is for all kinds of fighting (*kiṁ svit praharaṇaṁ çreṣṭhaṁ sarvayuddheṣu*), replies that the sword (*asi*) is *agryaḥ praharaṇānām*; the bow is *ādyam*. He further makes the sword, *asi*, the type of justice; the Pleiades are its constellation; Agni is its divinity, etc. One sees that the later view obtains here (xii. 166. 3 ff., 82 ff.). The sword is par excellence the weapon. Compare what precedes this, where it is said that one man with a sword is able to protect himself, if his bow be broken and horses slain, against bowmen, club-men, and spear-men. Contrast with this the bow as the real weapon of the Epic knight, and also of the earlier law-books. In Manu the bow is still the chief weapon, as it is in the early Epic.

The *çakti* was a spear or javelin particularly used as an adjunct to the bow by the warrior in the chariot. Hence it often receives the name of 'chariot-spear.'* This weapon is made of iron,† and is represented as cast after the club-casting had failed.‡ Like the 'golden club, we find the *çakti* spoken of as of gold: that is, with gold plating or gilding, and with beryl adornment at the same time.§ The continuation of the last passage quoted tells us that, after the 'terrible firm iron spear adorned with gold and beryl and like unto the rod of Yama, had been cast, it was cut into two pieces by arrows. The same event occurs elsewhere.‖ Besides, the spear was adorned with bells.¶

The spear was grasped with both hands, and flung at the opposing war-car. We see in the car-use that, as I said of the arrow, the epithet *dīpta*, glowing, may be used without implying fire; that the knight 'discharged the glowing war-car-spear' can only be taken poetically. In the following, we see the special use of the *çakti*, or chariot-spear. The knights in the war-cars 'flung the chariot-spear.' 'He seized the spear, the mighty, with gilded staff, but made of iron—and this spear of great power he flung, hurling it forth with both his arms.' 'He, standing in the war-car, seized the chariot-spear of golden shaft, of sharp point, spotless—hurling it aloft he flung it—and it entered the heart of the foe.'** The spear, like other weapons, for smoothness' sake was oiled.†† In distinction from the weapons that killed many, the *çakti* is termed 'slayer of one;' for, once used, it was lost.‡‡

---

* Although the Petersburg Lexicon correctly explains the *rathaçakti* as a 'banner-staff' in the passage which it quotes (*rathaçaktiṁ samāçritya*, H. 9363; like *dvajayaṣṭiṁ samāçritaḥ*, vi. 101. 48), the general use is that of a weapon.

† *āyasī çaktiḥ*, vi. 104. 30; *sarvapāraçavī*, 116. 52.

‡ *hemapaṭṭā gadā*, the golden-plated club, is flung first; then the *çakti*, ib.

§ i. 194. 7; vii. 186. 42; vi. 111. 11.

‖ In vi. 53. 14; 54. 111, it is cut into three pieces (the description coinciding with the last).

¶ *sarvapāraçavīṁ çaktim . . saghaṇṭām prāhinot*, vii. 92. 66: eight of these are casually mentioned, vii. 106. 29; or even one hundred: *çataghaṇṭā çaktiḥ*, iii. 286. 3 (different kinds of spears, iii. 290. 24).

** I group the texts quoted together: *rathaçaktiṁ dīptām mumoca*, x. 6. 13; *rathaçaktīḥ samutkṣipya*, vii. 32. 58; *dorbhyām āyamya* (in vii. 107. 16) is like *dhanur āyamya*, stretching forth and aiming with the bow; *sa rathe . . tiṣṭhan rathaçaktim parāmṛçat svarṇadaṇḍām akuṇṭhāgrāṁ sunirmalām, samudyamya ca cikṣepa . . sā tasya hṛdayam . . bibheda*, ix. 10. 38. In xii. 4. 18, *rathaçakti* is grouped with arrows and other missiles. One sees, the use is almost constant, like the epithets. Compare R. vi. 80. 23–24, *çaktir dīpyamānā svatejasā tolitā mahātmanā*. In ib. 32 (cf. 87. 25) we find *aṣṭaghaṇṭā çaktiḥ*: see above.

†† *tāiladhāutāḥ sutejanāḥ* (*niṣpetur vimalāḥ çaktyaḥ*), vi. 87. 28.

‡‡ *ekaghnī* (opposed to *çataghnī*), vii. 183. 2.

We thus obtain a fair idea of what the poet conceived the *çakti* to be. It must have been rather large and heavy, and seems more a spear than a javelin. The other members of this genus are not so explicitly explained. They are evidently not so commonly used, and have not, so to speak, so much individuality. Commonly we find them in a group of fallen weapons (with perhaps the *çakti* among the number), and can only describe them by saying that they, therefore, could not have been synonymous; and, being occasionally called 'sharp,' and generally represented as 'flung,' they must have been sharp and flung. This is not very satisfactory. It is, perhaps, from a vagueness in the poet's mind that we are thus left in doubt. Chief in number appear to be among all the *paṭṭiça* and *ṛṣṭi*, the *kunta*, the *kaṇapa* and *kuṇapa*.

The *paṭṭiça* may also be an axe. But from the ordinary use I take it to be a spear used by the knight; while the *ṛṣṭi* seems to belong more to the common soldiers, and is perhaps a javelin, though the commentator takes it to be heavier than the *çakti*. The *kunta* has the special addition of iron, and may be a pike used for thrusting, against the inevitably hurled javelin. The high-born knights are represented at the opening of the war as girded with breast-plates and *ariṣṭa* (protective magical plants), with girdles (*kakṣā*), helmets, shields, swords, and *paṭṭiça*. A commentator to Manu defines *ṛṣṭi* as a sword, not a spear. All the war-passages I have noticed, however, make the *ṛṣṭi* a projectile. It is associated with a quiver in one passage that I do understand. Of the *kunta*, 'lance,' as of *kaṇapa* and *kuṇapa*, the passages I can offer show only an iron projectile, without nearer description. Late works make the *paṭṭiça* only a battle-axe, two-bladed; the *kunta* a six-sided lance, six or ten cubits long (Nītip.).*

---

* The *paṭṭiça*, sharp, flung, vi. 96. 57; 106. 22 ff.; 113. 39 ff.; vii. 25. 58; 44. 14: compare iv. 32. 10, *asibhiḥ paṭṭiçāiḥ prāsāiḥ çaktibhis tomarāir api . . saṁrabdhāḥ samare . . nijaghnur itaretaram.* The armor of the knights is given in v. 155. 12 ff. (in distinction from the common soldiers). *Baddha*, here used of all arms, means not 'fastened' but 'furnished.' In this passage, *ṛṣṭi* seems a common weapon, opposed to the knightly *paṭṭiça*, and differentiated from *ṛṣṭika*, immediately following (13). In v. 152. 15, we have *ṛṣṭayas tūṇasaṁyutāḥ*. N. to M iii. 133 gives the idea that *ṛṣṭi* may be a sword. Compare v. 155. 3, *saçaktīkāḥ saharṣṭayaḥ* (*çaktīka* = *çakti*), of the soldiers in general. The (*ayas-*)*kunta* or iron lance (?) is mentioned in vii. 148. 45; viii. 19. 34, etc. *Kaṇapa, kuṇapa* are spoken of in the same passages and in i. 227. 25; and with them is associated the 'sharp' *kampana* or dart, vii. 156. 141; vi. 57. 24; 76. 4 ff., etc., but I can get no description out of the passages, except that they are all on occasion *kṣepaṇīya* or missile weapons (vi. 76. 6). *Goçīrṣa*, in vii. 178. 23, is probably a spear, not an epithet. In Nītip. the ring and cow-horn spear are emblematic of a king, another indication of Droṇa being late. These references, serving as examples, might be multiplied without further information gained. The gods fight with 'spears (*çakti*) of different kinds,' i. 30. 47 ff. *Çakti* is the generic name.

5. Other offensive arms. Those already mentioned seem the most often referred to, most conspicuous arms of the knights. But equally common, and often united, appear the bare names of a number of weapons now to be quoted. They are scarcely divisible into classes, and their uses merge into each other. Indiscriminately hurled at the foe, or passing into the proper function of the next, confusion follows examination.

The knights have practically arms distinct from those of the common soldiers. But they are represented as using each and any. Only the base tools of the low-born they keep from—not throwing pitch and oil, not harassing the foemen—but all real arms are ready to their hand, stored in the war-car, used when needed. These general arms the Hindu divided into four classes. The division is late, schematic; but, though not explained, is familiar to the Epic: 'the four kinds of great weapons,' to which are added 'and the divine' (weapons). As a group they are termed 'the fourfold weapon-collection'; but arms are of 'various sorts,' and so various that many will not be confined to one rubric.[*] The gods have just such arms as men have, only they have some more powerful than most men; but knights, by the help of magic or divine intervention, may equal them in the use of arms.[†] Foreigners have some peculiar customs, and use many arms as specialists more aptly than natives. The different accomplishments have been explained above. To note is the excellency in Manu of special sections of India; in the pseudo-Epic, of outside nations, particularly. In the war-scenes also the arms of foreigners are noted as peculiar. Many are special to the 'barbarians.' Studying native interpretation, it is clear that the uses of many of these arms were unclear to the expounders. Use and form are differently interpreted. Many are totally unknown. The following are the chief weapons of secondary importance, not arranged according to the native four classes, but by their apparent importance and frequency of use. First may be mentioned the *bhindipāla*, for which I see no evidence that it is a sling or a tube-blown projectile, as later writers will. It appears to be missile, flung by hand, and is usually associated with darts, hammers, clubs, etc. A varied reading in one passage confirms this by showing us the wooden handle attached to the weapon.[‡] The *tomara* is a dart of iron, either straight, or, less often, a straight shaft bearing at the end a hook. This latter is probably the spit- or trident-*tomara*. According to the commentator, it has a wooden handle. Interesting is the confession conveyed in the special kind of dart called *viṣatomara*, 'a dart bearing poison'; doubtless to be taken literally.* The *tomaras* are represented as gilded, and must have been light, as they are compared to fiery locusts. They appear to be javelins, and are flung by the hand. But the commentator explains one sort as an arrow (see below). One is mentioned as an iron gilded staff, capable of piercing an arm and coming out beyond. Its sharp point is particularly emphasized.†

---

[*] viii. 7. 6, *mahāstrāṇi . . caturvidhāni . . divyāni cāi 'va; astragrāmaṁ caturvidhaṁ labdhvā* (learning), iii. 309. 18; *vividhāni çastrāṇi, nānāçastrāṇi*, i. 19. 12; 32. 12.

[†] Compare the commonplace weapons of the divinities in i. 30. 47 ff., etc., and see below.

[‡] The *bhindipāla* is mentioned in v. 19. 3; vi. 96. 57 ff.; 106. 22 ff.; vii. 25. 59; in v. 155. 1 ff., *çūlabhindipāla* is discarded by N. for *çāla-*, as the wood of this tree makes the handle.

Less important missiles are the hammer, axe, spit, and other less definite weapons, as follows. Although the axe and spit would antecedently not be regarded as missiles, their use in the Epic makes it necessary to group them as such.

The hammer, *mudgara*, is of iron (*ayoghana*), and is distinctly a missile, being cast with the *laguḍa* and with stones (*upala*). The divinities, as shown in the Indra-Vritra scene, employ the *mudgara* along with the sword and spear, etc.‡

The axe, *paraçvadha*, *kuliça*, is often mentioned as a missile. It might be termed a royal weapon, being chiefly used by nobles. The battle-axe (*kuṭhāra*) is Paraçu-Rāma's pet weapon. A distinction (unknown) is made between *paraçu* and *paraçvadha*.§

Çiva's weapon, the trident, is imitated among arms by the *çūla* or spit, a missile of iron, but not very effective, and easily cut in two. The *çūlaçakti* is a trident-headed spear.‖

---

* Both the *aṅkuçatomara* and *viṣatomara* are found in the list of weapons in v. 155. 1 ff. The ordinary *tomara* is found *passim* in all heaps of weapons.

† vi. 113. 39; vii. 25. 58; 165. 36; viii. 27. 15 ff.; i. 19. 12: fourteen are flung at once, 'sharp as the sun's rays,' in vii. 29. 7: compare *tomarān agnisaṁkāçān chalabhān iva vegitān* (*mumoca*) in xiv. 75. 13, where they are as usual cut to pieces by arrows.

‡ xii. 282. 14. In vii. 25. 58 ff., *ayoghana*, defined by N. as *laguḍa*, is distinct from *mudgara*. *Kūṭamudgara*, R. vi. 37. 51; 75. 25, seems to be a hatchet rather than a hammer. I have not noted it among Epic arms. It may be, in the usual sense, concealed, a trick-weapon, but is possibly another kind of hammer. Compare *mudgarāḥ kūṭakhaḍgāç ca*, R. vi. 80. 4. According to the Nītip., the *mudgara* is three cubits long, weighing over a thousand pounds.

§ v. 19. 3; vi. 96. 57 (*ayaskuntāiḥ paraçvadhāiḥ*): 46. 13: vii. 25. 59; Rāma's axe, xii. 49. 33; a distinction in *paraçu*, iii. 160. 58 (*paraçvadha*, flung); and in *kuliça*, iii. 20. 34, from *paraçvadha*, 33. Here N. gives *vajrāṇi*, thunderbolts, as the meaning of *kuliçāni*. *Paraçu* is properly nothing but a woodman's axe. Compare R. ii. 111. 10, *drumo yathā vane paraçunā kṛttaḥ*. So *dātra*, v. 155. 7, is merely a sickle.

‖ The last quotation from the third book (iii. 20. 33 ff.) mentions *gadā*, *hala*, *prāsa*, *çūlaçakti*, *çakti*, *paraçvadha*, *kuliça*, *pāça*, *ṛṣṭi*, *kaṇapa*, *çara*, *paṭṭiça*, *bhuçuṇḍī* in a heap. For use stated above, compare vi. 92. 27; ix. 21. 24; *triçūla*, trident of Çiva, vii. 202. 42. Vishnu has the *cakra* and *çārṅga*, Çiva the *çūla* or *pināka*.

The *bhuçuṇḍī*, defined in the Petersburg Lexicon as 'a certain weapon,' is a projectile hand-weapon, used with clubs, spits, etc., and is made of iron. More definite statements fail me, although the weapon is often mentioned.*

The *prāsa* (*prāça*), from its name a projectile, is sharp and broad, as well as spotless. Its edge is particularly spoken of (see lists above), but I see no Epic reason for claiming that the *prāsa* was the same as the quoit, or the trident. Wilson says it is the 'quoit, or the same as *kunta*.' Later works than the Epic make the *prāsa* the same as the discus, *cakra*, or a spear of seven cubits.

Among projectiles we must reckon the claw-knife or concealed knife (*nakhara*, *vāçī*), besides the simple knife (*kṣura*), used as projectile, or as a kind of hand-weapon with which to tear out the eyes of a foe. The lower classes of fighters are armed with masses of weapons of all base sorts, such as pitch, burning oil, etc., that do not probably come under the head of weapons at all. They were carried by the infantry (xv. 23. 4), and by bands of men on the elephants.† It is interesting to note how such a list as this, attributed to all the soldiers, contradicts the whole spirit of the military 'code.'

Not to be flung, but to be held before one, and to pierce and bore the foe's body, are the *çalākā* and *çaṅku*, said by the commentator to be identical. They are apparently sharp pointed stakes, perhaps of wood (vii. 25. 50; vi. 46. 34).

Before passing to the subject of defensive armor, we have yet to examine the so-called fire-arms and divine weapons. As a close, however, to the general offensive weapons already described, it may be well first to give collectively, and in the manner in which the Epic describes them, the general weapons thought of as necessary for a well-equipped army. The collective impression thereby given us is stronger than that produced by the separate individuals. We see more clearly the Hindu conception of an army. In quoting these groups, the explanations already given may be incorporated without comment; in doubtful cases the commentator's word is accepted, and indicated by quotation-marks; in the few new unwarlike implements used as weapons, however, a word is added.

---

* iii. 15. 8; vii. 25. 58; ix. 45. 111. See the quotation iii. 20. 34, above. The *çūla* and *bhuçuṇḍī* are mentioned as equal to *çūla* and *paṭṭiça* (together with the word *çūlavarṣa* as epithet uniting both) in iii. 170. 3. It seems a sort of spear, used most commonly in close standing with *paṭṭiça*, *çūla*, etc., as here. One passage represents iron spears, quoits, stones, and *bhuçuṇḍīs* as raised high in the air with the hand and thrown, i. 227. 25. R. has a companion to the *bhuçuṇḍī*, namely *trikaṇṭaka*, which, I take it, is a late equivalent for *çūla*, meaning trident (R. iii. 28. 25).

† A list is given in v. 155. 'Hair-catchers,' balls of hot iron, sand, oil, pots of poisonous stuff ('snakes'), cords, nooses, concealed knives, etc. *Kāṇḍadaṇḍaka* may be a regular weapon (trident). Ploughshares (*sīra*) are found here, and baskets with pans of coals. The noose, *pāça* or *rajju* (cord), is used to throttle the foe. Some such noose seems to be used by the knights as a lasso in viii. 53. 24 ff., called a *pādabandha*, or *nāgam astram*, 'snake-weapon.' Compare with this R. v. 46. 15, *astrapāçāir na çakyo 'haṁ baddhum atyāyatāir api.*

A typical sea of weapons is casually presented in the following passage (vii. 178. 23 ff.): 'they rained upon each other with a stream of weapons—iron clubs, spits, swords, knives, darts, arrows, wheels, axes, iron balls, staves, cow-horns, mortars,' etc., with a last resort to trees torn up,[*] and other native resources of half-demoniac beings such as here engaged.[†] In this passage, under 'clubs,' we have four kinds mentioned, (*gadā*, *parigha*, *pināka*, *musala*); lances and darts are trebly named (*prāsa*, *tomara*, *kampana*); arrows are of three names (*bhalla*, *çara*, *nārāca*); and there remains the cow-horn and *bhindipāla* (the former doubtful), and the mortar (*ulūkhala*); with iron balls that are probably slung or dropped heated on the foe.[‡]

But perhaps the best example may be drawn from the opening of the battle-scenes, already referred to for many special kinds of arms. Here we read how the great mass of soldiers drew out in array, and what the arms were: of the common soldier first, and then specially of the knights (v. 155. 1 ff.). 'Now the king drew out his forces and divided his eleven armies according to their highest work, their medium ability, and their worthlessness.[§] Then they advanced, armed and provided with the chariot-planks,[1] with large quivers,[2] with the 'leather protectors of the war-car,"[3] with javelins,[4] and 'quivers for horse and elephant,"[5] with the foot-soldiers' quivers,[6] with metal spears,[7] with heavier wooden-handled spears,[8] with flags and banners,[9] with heavy arrows,[10] with cords and nooses,[11] with blankets, with hair-seizers;[12] with jars of oil, molasses, or melted butter, sand, and snakes;[13] with lighted (?) powder of pitch,[14] with bell-hung spears or swords,[15] with 'water heated by iron balls,' and stones,[16] with spits and spears,[17] with 'missiles of wax melted,' and hammers,[18] with trident or spiked staves,[19] with ploughshares and darts (javelins) that are poisoned,[20] with 'baskets with which to fling hot balls, and the box containing these balls resting in the baskets,'[21] with hooked-lances,[22] with wooden breast-plates,[23] with weapons concealed in wood,[24] with 'blocks of wood with iron spikes,'[25] with tiger and leopard skins 'for man and war-car,' with dart and horn,[26] with crooked javelins, with axes, spades, and oil of sesame and flax,[27] and gilded nets.'[28]* Such was the array of the Kurus, excluding the chariot-description following, where we also find javelins, bows, etc.

---

[*] Compare R. vi. 55. 28; also ib. 61. 20, and often.

[†] The *rākṣasa* usually fights with ordinary arms, but he is not a fair fighter; he is stigmatized as *kūṭayodhin*, vii. 179. 21, but more, on the whole, for his tricks than for his weapons.

[‡] As an appendix-group add vii. 148. 36 ff.; ix. 45. 108 ff. (*praharaṇāni kīrtyamānāni çṛṇu*).

[§] *sāra*, *madhya*, *phalgu*. The commentator says 'stationed in the van, center, and rear,'; but this is the consequence of their division by quality. *Phalgu* is worthlessness, not rear: compare viii. 11. 24. *mahācamūḥ phalguçeṣā*, 'the miserable remnant of the great force.'

These weapons are all retained or discharged by the hand. No mention of the *nivartana*, or property of (discharging, *prayoga*, and) recovering missiles, would lead us to suspect a specially adept band of lassoists or boomerangists, though the exercise of this art gave rise to the *nivartana* superstition, and the latter is elsewhere in the Epic one of the forms of magic power gained by religious meditation. The nooses rarely come prominently into action. They were cast from the raised hand. The iron balls do not appear to be more than one of the beloved missiles mentioned as stone, sand, pitch, potted snakes, etc., etc.—crude and brutal roughness all.*

---

* [1] *anukarṣa;* [2] *tuṇīra;* [3] *varūtha;* [4] *tomara;* [5] *upāsaṅga;* [6] *niṣaṅga;* [7] *çakti;* [8] *ṛṣṭi;* [9] *dhvaja, patākā;* [10] *çarāsanatomara*, 'a very heavy arrow discharged by a bow' (not a hand-*tomara*, javelin); [11] *rajju, pāça;* [12] *paricchada* and *kacagraha:* both are doubtful; perhaps *paristara* should be read and *karagraha;* in either case the first word is equivalent to *āstaraṇa*, blankets or coverings of some sort; and the second word, if not hair-catcher, is hand-catcher (*kaca-* is the usual word: compare vii. 36. 25, N. '*aṅkuça*'); *vikṣepa* is added to show that it is a weapon cast upon one (perhaps also the *paristara* is, if equal to *āstaraṇa*, the round-circling weapon, boomerang: compare Rājend., Ind. Aryans, i. 314; *āstara* is boomerang in the Nītiprak., but no form of this sort is found, I think, in the Epic as a projectile); [13] *tāilaguḍavāluka* and *āçīviṣaghaṭa;* [14] *sarjarasapāṅsavaḥ*, I am not quite sure of the meaning; [15] *ghaṇṭaphalaka*, on sword or spear or even shield, perhaps, *phalaka* is board or blade; [16] *ayoguḍajalopala* (the natives and admirers love to extract cannon, or at least catapults, from every mention of iron ball and stone; the commentator here explains the use of the iron balls reasonably, but thinks the stones must have been flung by 'machines': they were flung by hand); [17] *çāla-* or *çūla-bhindipāla* (see above); [18] *madhūcchiṣṭa-mudgara;* [19] *kāṇḍadaṇḍa*, = *kaṇṭakadaṇḍa*, or v. l. *daṇḍakaṇṭaka*, same meaning; [20] *sīraviṣatomara;* [21] *çūrpapiṭaka* (compare what was stored in the chariot, besides quivers and breastplates, in R. ii. 39. 19 ff., *piṭaka* with *khanitra;* and ib. 37. 5, *khanitrapiṭake* . . *saçikye*, baskets with cords): [22] *aṅkuçatomara* (or javelins, as before); [23] *kīlakavaca*, doubtful, perhaps *kīlakrakaca*, saws in wooden handles; [24] *vāçī* or *vāsī* (see above); [25] *vṛkṣādana;* [26] *ṛṣṭi* and *çṛṅga:* '*ṛṣṭi* is a hand-missile used among the Dravidians, crooked, with wooden shaft (*phalaka*)': *çṛṅga* is curiously defined by N. as 'a means of freeing (killing) one bleeding when smitten with a club; but it may mean a horn to void excrements in' (compare the weapon [?] *huḍa* or *hula*, in the list of iii. 15. 5, defined by a commentator to Manu, reading *huḍa* for *guḍa* in M. iii. 133, as a double-edged sword; but the Epic commentator, in iii. 284. 4, defines it as a privy-horn, *mūtrādyutsarjanārtham çṛṅgam*); [27] *prāsa* (*bhalla*), *kuṭhāra, kuddāla, tāilakṣāumasarpis:* the last also explained as protective oil-cloth; [28] *rukmajāla.*

The barbarians are not worse than the natives as to their arms, but are occasionally spoken of in an angry way as using un-Aryan methods. What could be more Aryan, however, than the arms poured out upon Arjuna by the barbarians in general (*mlecchas*)? 'They cast upon him the eared reed arrows and iron arrows, the javelins, darts, spears, clubs, and *bhindipālas*' that the Aryans themselves used.† But we learn that the Kirātas use poison (and appear to be blamed for it!); that the Kāmbojas are particularly 'hard to fight with'; that the barbarians generally are 'evil-minded'; that the Çakas are 'strong as Indra' (vii. 112. 38 ff.); that the barbarians generally use 'various weapons'; that the Kāmbojas, again, are 'cruel and bald'; that the Yavanas carry especially arrows and darts; and that the mountaineers, Parvatīyas, are proficient in throwing stones, an art the Kurus are asserted to be unfamiliar with.‡

The pseudo-Epic groups several foreign excellencies in warlike matters under one head, and enjoins that each allied nation shall use its own arms. 'Let each man fight according to his native usage. The Gāndhārāḥ and Sindhu-sāuvīrāḥ use claw-knives and darts (quoits?) (*nakharaprāsayodhinaḥ*); the Uçīnarāḥ are good at all weapons; the Prācyāḥ are excellent at elephant-fighting (*mātaṅgayuddha*); they are also deceitful fighters (*kūṭayodhinaḥ*); the Yavanāḥ and Kāmbojāḥ, with those living near Mathurā, are expert in kicking (or boxing? *niyuddhakuçalāḥ*); the Dākṣiṇātyāḥ are especially swordsmen (*asipāṇayaḥ*)’ (xii. 101. 1 ff.).

---

* The iron balls are flung with clubs, as in vii. 178. 23 (quoted above). As they serve to fill the list of the city's possessions, N. naturally translates *guḍa* (as usual) by *golaka* in iii. 15. 8, helped thereto by *agni*, just before. But adornment and defense are united here throughout, and *saguḍaçṛṅgikā purī* may as well mean 'with ball-tipped horns' as with a machine no one ever heard of for casting iron balls. It is useless, however, for these commentators to see that the iron balls and other 'powder'-implying 'machines' are always flung by hand. This they pass, and translate always from the modern point of view of late works that have specialized these terms. As we saw above, the hot balls were probably brought boxed in baskets (on the elephants) and dropped. Oil fires and heated sands are used in mid-battle. Such a combination as *sagadāyoguḍaprāsāḥ* (carried and discharged) would alone decide the matter to an impartial judge. We have here (vii. 36. 24) simply 'clubs, iron balls, and darts,' as hand-missiles, and certainly, as so explained, no more awkward than a pot of snakes. Compare vii. 25. 59, *pāṅsuvātāgnisalilāir bhasmaloṣṭṛtṛṇadrumāiḥ*. The nooses are used as said above in ix. 45. 109 (*pāçodyatakarāḥ kecit*). The plough-share (*sīra*) is Balarāma's pet weapon; *halāyudha* is a common type. In ix. 60. 9 an attack is actually made with the plough-share, *lāṅgala*. It is not infrequent as an ordinary weapon. Compare the list *halaçaktigadāprāsacarmakhaḍgarṣṭitomara*, vii. 112. 15. Worth noting is the omission of *lavitra*, scythe, enumerated among *amukta* in Nītip., since we find this neither as weapon nor as car-defense, though knives protect divine cars.

† *karṇinālīkanārācāis tomaraprāsaçaktibhiḥ, musalāir bhindipālāiç ca*, viii. 81. 12 ff.

‡ vii. 119. 14 ff.; 121. 14; *açmayuddha, çilāyuddha*, ib. 31–45, 36, 32.

As to the use of eared (barbed) weapons generally, of which I have spoken under the head of arrows, it is worth noting that just what the law in this regard forbids is found again and again; and that, on the other hand, the like pretension to fire-arms on account of the later use of *nalika* is utterly impossible for the Epic, on account of its use as simple arrow or projectile by hand.[*]

I have quoted above the absurd statement that all the Kurus were ignorant of the art of stone-fighting, as contrasted with the mountaineers, who are especially ‘stone-fighters.’[†] But our last reference to the rude and irregular fighting of all combatants will dispute this statement. For when two fighting fail of weapons, they take to aught their ingenuity suggests, ‘dirt, fire, water, ashes, stones, wood,’ and so forth, and then attack with the fists.[‡] Fisticuffs, alternating with hairpulling, biting, etc., ends in a wrestling match. If this does not succeed, he whose attendants can help lets them run up and cut the other's head off.[§] In another scene we have resort to fists and feet at once when clubs give out; and such expressions as ‘nail to nail,’ ‘hair to hair,’ ‘tooth to tooth,’ show the close position of combatants.[‖]

The divine weapons, with the question of certain ‘machines,’ will now be discussed. It is not the writer's fault that these are grouped together. They have been implicated by others, and so closely that for convenience' sake it is better to speak of them together. For the Hindu warriors, not content with earthly arms, received from spiritual powers or Powers certain 'divine arms,' which are clearly magical and demoniac. They had, too, what they called 'machines' and 'hundred-killers.' The later Hindus acquired gun-powder, and employed earlier terms in a new sense. Machines and hundred-killers were converted into cannon, rockets, etc. Naturally the next step was made by European scholars. The divine weapons become in their hands only gunpowder-weapons. For, as with all heavenly manifestations, fire is spoken of with the divine weapons. This rational and radical explanation is pleasing because it is radical. We do not believe in divine weapons, and are glad to have a rational explanation. Nevertheless, our Hindus did believe in them. They never ventured to interpret divine arms as fire-arms. We cannot, then, deny their fire-divine-arms as products of their poetry. Whether these really existed is of no consequence. The question is, did they conceive of fire-divine-arms as probable and natural. They did, and they also imagined divine arms without fire. Thus, a bow or a sword is a 'divine arm' when given by God, or endowed by the might of the user's piety with superhuman power. Fire is not, therefore, a necessary concomitant of divine arms. Hence no reason exists for supposing that earthly fire manifested in a weapon first suggested 'divine arms.' What, now, to the Hindu are the divine arms? They are mentioned as a matter of course in very many battle-scenes (e. g. vi. 74. 6). Arjuna uses them when hard pressed on all occasions. How does he use them? He meditates them into existence. They are weapons of magic. Many other heroes have them.[*] Now they are two-fold, as said above. Either like the 'weapon of Parjanya,' weapons fashioned in heaven and endowed by the gods with power; or the ordinary weapons, bewitched by spiritual mastery of nature. They are not always fiery. 'Fiery' is not always a mark of divine weapons. Two results flow from these considerations. Fire is used not of fire, but of the swift sharp biting power of a weapon. Prayer and meditation inspire the most ordinary weapon.[†]

---

[*] *karṇinālīka, varāhakarṇa, vikarṇa* are species of one genus. Compare note above, and vii. 166. 23 ff.; 170. 35 (*vipāṭhakarṇinārācāiḥ*, with *kṣura, vatsadanta*, etc.); vii. 47. 20 (*taṁ karṇinā ’tāḍayad dhṛdi*); ib. 48. 1 (*sa karṇaṁ karṇinā karṇe punar vivyādha*); vii. 169. 9 (*karṇinā ’kena vivyādha* . . ).

[†] *parvatīyāḥ pāṣāṇayodhinaḥ* (*-pāṇayaḥ*), but *kuravaḥ sarve nā ’çmayuddhaviçāradāḥ*, vii. 121. 14 ff., 31.

[‡] vii. 25. 58 ff.; i. 19. 17.

[§] *padācoraḥ samākramya sphurato ’pāharac chiraḥ*, viii. 28. 38. Fisticuffs (*muṣṭiyuddha*), hair pulling (*keçagraha*), are esteemed less scientific than wrestling (*bāhuyuddha*); for the last has its termini technici, and yields little to the art of weapons. Compare the *pṛṣṭhabhaṅga, sampūrṇamūrcchā, pūrṇakumbha*, attitudes of wrestlers, in the Jarāsandha scene, ii. 23. 19; and compare the famous wrestling of Bhīma in iii. 11. 62 (repeated in iv. 22) and iv. 13.

[‖] vii. 177. 45. Compare viii. 49. 80: *kacākaci yuddham āsīd dantādanti nakhānakhi* (like *rathārathi*) *muṣṭiyuddhaṁ niyuddhaṁ ca*. Compare, for the last, *niyuddha* ‘feet-fight,’ vi. 76. 4, *asiyuddhe niyuddhe gadāyuddhe ca* (with arms following). - As *nakha*, ‘nail,’ passes into *nakhara*, ‘claw knife’ (e. g. vii. 19. 32, *vipraviddhāsinakharāḥ*), so *muṣṭi* seems to pass into a ‘dagger’ in *muṣṭika* as used later, but in the Epic this *muṣṭika* equals *muṣṭiyuddha*. The same irregular paroxysmal fighting characterizes the battles in R.: ‘tearing hair, biting ears,’ etc., with much noise in every scene: e. g. R. vi. 37. 50; ib. 54. 57 ff.; 98. 25.

---

[*] The later literature is also given to the employment of mystic arms. Compare their use (*āgneyam astram*, etc.) in acts one and five of the Utt. Rāmacarita.

[†] vi. 117. 36, *divyāny astrāṇi saṁcintya prasaṁdhāya . . sa tāir astrāir mahāvegāir dadāha* . . . vi. 119. 16; vii. 16. 25, *taṁ çūram āryavratinam mantrāstreṣu kṛtaçramam*, etc. *Parjanyāstram* in vi. 121. 23. The *açani*, made by God, and furnished with eight bells (*aṣṭaghaṇṭā*), is flung and caught in battle, vii. 156. 157. A like weapon made by Rudra, with eight wheels, is of iron, vii. 175. 96; the *nārāyaṇa-astra*—end of vii., especially adhy. 201—is late, like the eight-wheeled one

We may here consider more particularly some of the weapons appearing most fire-like. The 'wheel of fire' is a quoit-disc, which we have seen among heaps of ordinary arms on

---

the *astram āindram* is more common, vii. 157. 37–39 (see below). The arrow cast by Arjuna, in viii. 90. 103, is 'fire-like, terrible, with snake-like poison, stone-hearted (*açmasāra*), and divine,' for he discharged this 'saying a prayer over it' (*abhimantrya*). So in vii. 201. 16 ff., a weapon incanted becomes an *āgneyam astram*, 'a fire weapon,' but it is only a 'glowing arrow' for the bow (*abhimantrya çaraṁ dīptam*). Arjuna's specially divine weapons are a sword and a bow. But he has besides a number of others; and in fact they are unlimited; for, whenever he chooses, he says his incantation and makes ordinary arrows divine. Compare iii. 245. 17, 26, 25 (*divyāstrapramantritāḥ . . khacarāḥ*). Karṇa's God-given earrings and mail (iii. 300–311) are exchanged for an ordinary spear (*çakti*), but so inspired that it returns to the hand when it has been discharged and slain many; this spear may only, like Pāçupata, be used in extreme need (iii. 310. 33). Arjuna's weapons, being most prominent, may be mentioned here in a group. He has the *sthūṇakarṇa*, *indrajāla*, *sāura*, *āgneya*, *sāumya*, *çabdavedha* (loc. cit.). He has the sword of Çiva and the *antardhāna* of Varuṇa; the *vajram astram* and *açanis* (thunderbolts, lightnings); the *sammohana* that gives distraction; the self-discharging returning weapon called 'Brahmā's head.' Compare iii. 40. 15; 41; iv. 66. 8; iii. 44. 4 (in ib. 100. 11, the *vajra* is *ṣaḍasri*); i. 133. 18 (*brahmaçiro nāmā 'straṁ saprayoganivartanam*); other divine arms from Prajāpati, Indra, Agni, Rudra, in iv. 64. 23; the divine weapons of Arjuna, like those in the Rāmāyaṇa (R. i. 30. 23), turn and address their master, iv. 45. 26–27. By the *āgneya* or Fire-weapon he made fire; by the *vāruṇa* or Water-weapon, water; by the *vāyavya* or Air-weapon, air, i. 135. 19 (which shows the *āgneya* as Fire-weapon, not as fire-weapon); *pārjanya*, *bhāuma*, *pārvata* follow; the *antardhāna* causes disappearance; by their aid he becomes short, tall, etc. Arjuna gives an exhibition of his god-given arms, the bow, the arrows, the horn (Devadatta), etc., in iii. 175. 1 ff.; and in vii. 30. 15 ff., as an exhibition of magic, Çakuni showers down from the sky all sorts of weapons, *laguḍāyoguḍāçmānaḥ çataghnyaç ca saçaktayaḥ*, etc. (*asthisaṁdhi* is interpreted 'with bone *phalaka*'), in all twenty-four, 'and other weapons.' Observe that clubs and spears as well as *çataghnis* characterize the downfall. The *bārhaspatyam āgneyam* given Arjuna by Droṇa is hurled at the Gandharva, and burns the car, glowing, i. 170. 31. But following this we see the magic reappear. In iii. 170. 20 a *mādhavaṁ nāmā 'stram* is added to the list, and in v. 96. 42 we find that all the divine tricks are placed in the bow Gāṇḍīva, for *kākudīka* (puts the foe asleep, in 183. 16–18 with waking, *sambodhana*), *çuka* (confuses), *nāka* (maddens), *akṣisaṁtarjana* (incantation), *saṁtāna* (uninterrupted flow of darts), *nartaka* (*pāiçāca*, makes the foe jump), *ghora* (*rākṣasa*, horrible qualities), and *āsya modaka* (the foe kills himself by putting stones in his mouth), all rest in the bow. They are purely magical. There are, by the way, three especially divine bows: Varuṇa's Gāṇḍīva, Indra's Vijaya, Vishnu's Çārṅga (horn-bow); but Gāṇḍīva is the best bow, as Sudarçana (Vishnu's discus) is the best general weapon (to unite two accounts in v. 158. 4–5; 54. 12). Droṇa's arms are the *āindram*, *vāyavyam*, *āgneyam*, etc., iv. 58. 52. In R. we find a hero rather exhibiting disdain of these arms: 'fie on my divine arms,' he cries (R. v. 34. 15). The mantras used for any purpose of incantation are from the Atharva-Veda (*imam mantraṁ gṛhāṇa tvam āhvānāya divāukasām*; and *mantragrāmaḥ . . atharvaçirasi çrutaḥ*, iii. 305. 16, 20). In R. i. 30. 4 ff. is a huge list of these and similar divine arms. Compare ib. 24. 12, where there are also 'arms unknown to the gods' (*devāç ca na vidur yāni*)!

any battle-field. It became the weapon of Vishnu, and hence its divine character. Perpetually we have the old common quoit, flung like a hammer by men, and the new spiritualized divine weapon, with its attributes transferred again to the human arms. But, fire or not, no one can claim gun-powder for it. It is picked up and flung, and caught, and cuts off a head. It is flung along with battle-axes and arrows and swords; it is cut in two—it is an ordinary missile weapon, undescribed, except in the case of the divine copy, which is fiery, sunlike, with a thousand spokes (rays).[*]

We may turn now, having seen how purely poetical are the divine arms, to those instruments of war the names of which a later age employed to designate powder-weapons. The iron ball, *ayoguḍa*, which, we have seen, is not to be differentiated from the mass of ordinary projectiles,[†] is claimed as a 'cannon'-ball, because there is mention made of 'machines.' But we can safely leave the ball till we establish the 'machine.' We saw in the paragraph on the Hindu city that these machines, *yantra çataghnī*, were posted as part of a city's defense, and in all probability were employed to cast heavy shafts or let fall stones, as they are posted so as to command approaches below. They are (when their position is specified) not at the gates, but above them. That the *yantra* or *mahāyantra* is found in the camp is, when we remember that the camp is conceived of as a miniature city, not enough to make us believe it a field-machine for projectiles; that it is rarely found on the field, and then not possibly used as a cannon, substantiates its powderless character. On the other hand, negatively, it is inconceivable that such primitive arms as are used throughout the war in the Epic account should have been employed contemporaneously with powder, guns, and cannon; it is further inconceivable that, had they been used, they should not have been mentioned as such in a way to leave no doubt in the reader's mind. Of this perfect silence in regard to the use of guns and cannon on the part of the poet Oppert gives a very naïve explanation. He says of the use of gun-powder, that it 'was so common that it was not worth mentioning.' Finally, it is positively against the use of these arms as described to explain them as fire-arms. A good conclusive instance is found in the use of the word that Oppert takes to mean a gun—really one of the barbed arrows we saw so frequently used. The barb called the 'ear' Oppert cleverly explains as the lock, trigger, etc.; but when we read 'they cannot draw the arrow of speech out of a man's body, although they draw out barbed reed arrows and iron arrows,' we refuse from the connection alone to think it possible that 'barbed reed arrows' has already passed into the meaning 'guns.'[*] To take these weapons in order: the 'fire-weapon' or 'fire-wheel' I have already shown to be a divine weapon, and the fire transferred to the ordinary discus, which is constantly used as a common hand-projectile. The *nālīka*, *karṇinālīka*, constantly in connection with *nārāca*, the ordinary iron arrow, is nothing but the genus to a species called 'boar-ear arrow' (*varāhakarṇa*), and is used by knights standing in their chariots shooting with their bows.[†] The *çataghnī* (or *-ghni*) has often been noticed in the groups of projectiles. The gunpowder-champion assures us that it is a rocket or something of the sort in late literature, or even a cannon, and must be the same in the Epic. It means a 'hundred killer,' against the spear as a 'single-killer' (see above). We saw, however, just now, that if a spear is properly spiritualized it can also kill its hundreds and return to its owner. In the Epic use it is a simple projectile. It is flung by hand (Wilson denies this), and, like a sword or a spear, is 'split to pieces' by the arrows of the foe. Just as a sword or spear is ornamented with bells, so a *çataghnī* is ornamented with bells. It forms one of a group of missiles, darts, arrows, etc. As common arrows are called glowing, so the *çataghnī* is 'bright' and 'horrible'; but even a bow is like 'a wheel of fire.' Fire-comparisons are employed for poetic effect. Only a prosaic or forced interpretation would allow us to render 'fiery' as really 'of fire.' A knight seizes a quantity of *çataghnīs*, along with quoits, balls, and stones, for throwing purposes. The demons, indeed, employ these, but so they do all other mortal arms. The name is used as a strong argument, but we must not forget that, if 'hundred-killer' seems to imply a projectile that explodes, a common hook is called an 'all-killer.' Moreover, this very name is applied to Bhīma's ordinary club.*

---

[*] *āgneyam astram . . cakraṁ lebhe*, vii. 11. 21; *cakraṁ divyaṁ sahasrāram agṛhṇāt . . kṣurāntam . . . sūryābham maṇiratnavibhūṣitaṁ cikṣepa*, vii. 175. 46: but compare *iṣūn dhanūṅṣi khaḍgāṅç ca cakrāṇi ca paraçvadhān . . . ciccheda*, viii. 47. 12; with the *çataghnī*, in viii. 27. 32. The discus, i. e. of Vishnu, is again, in contrast to these, described as magical; it returns to its owner, is five cubits long (v. 68. 3, *sūpahnava; vyāmāntara* [2] = '*sasaṁhāra, pañcahasta*'). It is also called *rathāṅga*, as the *cakra* is literally a wheel.

[†] Compare *ayoġuḍa* with *prāsa*, *gadā*, etc., in the quotations given above.

---

[*] v. 34. 79, *karṇinālīka-nārācāḥ* opposed to *vākçalya*.

[†] Compare the quotations given above under 'arrows,' and add e. g. *karṇinālīkanārācāiç chādayām āsa tad balam*, vi. 106. 13, of a bowman; *karṇinārāca*, *varāhakarṇa*, *nālīka*, as arrows in vii. 179. 14; *rathinaç ca rathāir ājan karṇinālīkasāyakāiḥ*, *nihatya samare vīrān*, vi. 95. 31; so, too, viii. 81. 12. Arrows are like fire, but in the same breath like poison, both tropical: *viṣāgnipratimāḥ*, vii. 156. 128, a point discussed above. Observe also that in *nalikā* we have one word, in *nālīka* another; and that the true word for 'gun' is the later form *nalika*, which is not in the Epic at all. Compare Oppert's Weapons, pp. 11, 63.

The *yantra* or *mahāyantra*, the machine. This is asserted to be a cannon. Let us examine its actual use in the Epic.

In the battle-scenes, the *yantra* is a contrivance of almost any kind. It is a restrainer or protector, and serves as armor or holder of a fastening;† as the rope or the holder of a banner;‡ it is even a drumstick (vii. 23. 85); it is shattered (among the ordinary arms cast at the enemy), as if of fragile nature (vi. 96. 71); it is generalized as any contrivance, e. g. as a divine discus (i. 33. 3); it is part of the trappings of a war-car, the bands of the chariot (vii. 147. 88); it is a common projectile, flung with *çataghnī*, *cakra*, *guḍopala* (iii. 284. 30); even with the epithet *mahā* it is only one of a list of ordinary arms (v. 152. 15). Outside of war it is a 'contrivance in mid air' (a hanging target: *vāihāyasa*, i. 185. 10). It is used to sail a boat with (i. 141. 5). There are other 'movable' machines for the water (i. 128. 40: *yantrāṇi sāṁcārikāṇi*). But it is used for hoisting heavy things with, as in the Harivança, 'he raised the great bow with power as if an iron *yantra'*; or as in the Epic's first book, where a *yantra* is employed to move a mountain and set it on the tortoise.*

---

* *Çataghnī* as a simple projectile, flung, and split by arrows, vi. 113. 39 ff.; 96. 57 ff.; ornamented with bells like sword and spear, *çataghaṇṭā çaktiḥ*, iii. 286. 3; *çataghnīç ca sakiṅkiṇīḥ*, viii. 14. 35: compare ix. 17. 46; use as hand-projectile: 'Nakula cast a spear at him; Sahadeva, a club; Yudhishthira, a *çataghnī*,' and Çalya cut all these to pieces with his arrows, ix. 13. 22, cf. 26; used with darts, blocks of wood, and other like weapons, vii. 133. 44 (compare R. vi. 65. 21, use same); called *sughorā*, *citrā*, vi. 119. 2: other weapons called fiery, vii. 138. 21; 115. 30; 119. 32 (bright like fire, a bow like a wheel of fire); even in a chariot-spear and sword (but *rathaçakticakra* N.) we are told that the sword is a 'divine gleaming sword, like fire,' drawn from its sheath 'like a snake from its hole,' x. 6. 13–15; use with *cakra*, etc., *parigṛhya çataghnīç ca sacakrāḥ saguḍopalāḥ*, iii. 284. 31 (where it is added they flung them with a movement of the arm); exactly so in ix. 45. 109–110, *parighabāhavaḥ*, *çataghnīcakrahastāḥ*; the demons, again, in iii. 169. 16, use *çataghnī*, with *bhuçuṇḍī*, etc.; the ending *ghnī* is found in *ekaghnī*, a spear, vii. 183. 2; cf. *çatrughna*, a dart, vii. 156. 132; the hook called 'all-killer,' *sarvaghātī*, in vii. 29. 18 (*aṅkuça*): Bhima's club is *niṣkarṇā āyasī sthūlā supārçvā kāñcanī gadā çataghnī çatanirhrādā*, v. 51. 24. The *çataghni* is usually among city defenses, e. g. iii. 15. 7. The 'two-wheeled and four-wheeled' *çataghnyaḥ* of vii. 199. 19 can only be explained of poetically applied meteorological phenomena, like the other heavenly appearances there mentioned, where lights, and clubs, and quoits, and iron balls appear in all directions, and are the result of magic power. We might even take *catuçcakrā dvicakrāç ca* (*çataghnyo bahulā gadā*) as special phenomena. I have admitted the bare possibility of ignited arrows under the word *dīpta*, but can find such use only of arrows or similar weapons 'as if' glowing with fire, *agnikalpāiḥ pradīptāir iva pāvakāiḥ* (*yodhāiḥ*), etc., implying only this if we study the connection in which, as here, vii. 112. 51, such phrases occur. Compare the club in vii. 15; viii. 25. 15.

† vii. 90. 22; 93. 70; viii. 93. 9.

‡ vii. 92. 72, *yantramukta iva dhvajaḥ*; R. ii. 84. 8, *yantracyuta iva dhvajaḥ* (compare R. vi. 20. 19; *dhvajāv iva mahendrasya rajjuyuktāv aceṣṭatām*).

But the *yantra* is generally a defense in a fort (ii. 5. 36), over the gates of towns (iii. 15. 5; xii. 69. 45), where the use is nowise explained, except as by the later commentators taken to be machines to cast iron balls with powder, i. e. cannon. Here they are at most catapults.† The so-called *astrayantra*, instead of meaning cannon, means a manœuvre in fighting (as a technical term).‡ But the *yantra* is not unknown on the field; hence its peculiar properties, had it had any, could not have escaped notice (vi. 17. 33; 54. 55, 61; with *tomara*, *tūṇīra*, etc.). Again, we find that, when elephants are on a peaceful march, they carry *yantra* already 'strung,' with other weapons.§ The later division of the army as six-fold, including 'treasure and *yantra*,' applies to any machines (see above). The noise produced by the *yantra* may be thought, in spite of this number of disproving examples, to favor the meaning of cannon. For we read 'the noise of the great bow was like that of a *yantra*.' But there is no reason why the catapult discharging stone should not be so used; and negatively, again, why is the smoke of the discharge never alluded to?‖

Most marvelous in view of the powder-theory are these facts: that we have no smoke from the arms in question, and no gun-powder is mentioned;¶ that powder is always the rocks ground up by demons fighting; that the words for guns, *nalika* and *tūpāki*, are unknown; that the balls are generally oil-balls or hot-water-balls, and that no mention is made of discharging any other balls with (gun or) machines; that the later word for 'shot' is here 'arrow' (*çara*), and cannot be otherwise interpreted; that no mention of firing what is supposed to be a cannon occurs; that the Greek writers do not hint at the supposed use; that the one prop on which the hypothesis rests is that gun-powder 'was so common that it was not worth mentioning.'*

---

* H. 4515; i. 18. 12. Observe in H. that the slow motion of the gradually raised bow is the point of comparison; with the example from the first book, it is clear that a derrick is meant. Notice how late is the iron *yantra*. Compare xiv. 77. 26, *vicakarṣa dhanuḥ . . yantrasye 'va çabdo 'bhūn mahāṅs tasya*. Here the sound of the bow is like the discharge of a catapult (as well as cannon). So R. vi. 72. 24, *yantrasya ceṣṭamānasya mahato dānavāir iva*, of the sound of the demon's teeth. This is a good example, for fire came from his eyes, and fire-imagery is exhausted before coming to the *yantra*, which is reserved for noise.

† So in iii. 284. 4, where the account of the moat filled with crocodiles and guarded by stakes is followed by the statement that there were *kapāṭayantra*, machines to guard the doors; but the commentator explains 'to throw balls with,' although the following words mean only that there were balls and stones and the *huḍa*, which he renders privy-horn. Even the Puranic *yantra* is used in the same simple way, e. g. Ag. P. 240. 28; 168. 33. Compare above, p. 122, note.

‡ ix. 57. 18.

§ xv. 23. 9. *gajāḥ . . sajjayantrāyudhopetāḥ.*

‖ iii. 280. 36, *visphāras tasya dhanuṣo yantrasye 'va tadā babhāu:* compare the noise spoken of above, in xiv. 77. 26.

¶ In i. 30. 47 ff. (*çastrāṇi . . savisphuliṅgajvālāni sadhūmāni ca sarvaçaḥ*), sparks of fire and smoke are mentioned in connection with the arms of the gods; but here Agni, the god of fire, is the god of smoke, and clouds are made of smoke, according to the Hindu belief; so that this proves nothing for the use of smoke from fire-arms. Besides, in this passage only sharp axes, spears, discs, tridents, etc., occur, and the smoke and fire accompany them as divine manifestations, not proceed from them. Smoke and fire are mentioned in vi. 87. 34—from the elephants' tusks!

Let us remember, in closing our view of the offensive weapons, that not only are fire-arms uncertain in meaning, but many of the common arms have different meanings, and are differently interpreted by different scholiasts,† their local usage doubtless guiding them in their selection.‡

E. Armor and defense. The arms discussed above are of course in part defensive as well as offensive.

The difference between foot-man and knight comes now more prominently before us.§ The knights used most of the common weapons. In fact, except for the vulgarest weapons, the hot sand, burning oil, snakes, etc., the noble and well-born did not not hesitate to employ the arms of the common people. The latter likewise used the nobles' bow and sword and spear. Each class had its natural and more usual arms, a distinction between them (perhaps almost forced, when we come to detail) being attempted above.

But in protective armor the knight was more the gentleman. His equipments here rather than in offense marked him as apart from the foot-soldiers and horse-riders. The armor de-

---

*In iii. 171. 3, cliffs are ground up into stone-powder, *açmacūrṇāni*; the devils fling fire, rock, wind, and themselves into the bargain, as weapons. So, vii. 121. 45, of mountaineers. No *agnicūrṇa*, gun-powder, is mentioned, only *açmacūrṇa* in *açmayuddha*. The *açani* is the wheel-moved thunderbolt, at the command of a pious knight, but remaining a divine weapon, as above, and in iii. 42. 5.

† It is not the text, but the commentator's interpretation of the text, to which Oppert is indebted for the facts which he thus quotes: 'Maṇipura . . connected with Çukrācārya, the presumed author of Çukranīti . . is the same Maṇipur of which we have read in the Mahābhārata that it was provided with fire-arms and guns.' . . (Madras Journal, 1879, p. 167 ff.; in 1881, the late Nītiprakāçikā edited by the same).

‡ MacRitchie's accounts of the gypsies of India, 1886, makes probable that artillery was introduced into Europe by the Gypsies (Jāṭs or Jaṭṭs, as he thinks, of Sindh). A Hungarian chief of twenty-five tents made musket-balls and other ammunition in 1496 for Bishop Sigismond. So late a date cannot affect our interpretation of native Epic passages. Grierson holds that there is no proof that the Gypsies were Jaṭṭs (Ind. Ant. xvi. 38.)

§ *Çūrāḥ* are the knights, though not exclusively so; *sāinikāḥ*, the common soldiers; *yoddhāḥ* is used of both indifferently.

scribed belongs to the knight, not to the mass of those about him, although perhaps to a limited extent imitated by them.

In general descriptions (it should be said at the outset), it is difficult to know just where groups of protective armor belong. Thus, we know that skins were used as shields to the chariots, even rhinoceros-hide (*khādgakavaca*) being so employed; and that tiger- and leopard-skins (see above) are found in the general enumeration of protective devices for the whole army. Again, poetically the common equipment is naturally passed in silence, while the gaudy is described. We must, therefore, for the most part content ourselves with the arms of the knight.

We have a picture of a Hindu warrior, as he stands ready for battle. He is 'armed with a cuirass, and with guards for his hands, and has on his fingers the protector, on his arms the guard against the bow-string.'[*] To quote here (as frequently in other places) one example as illustrative of what might be shown by many, we find that the cuirass is described as of gold—that is, gilded—and, with one word, many understand such gilding as an ornament of most of the arms.[†] Decorations such as the 'hundred moons' of Dhrishtadyumna's shield are like the same ornaments in weapons of offense. Compare vi. 116. 19, shields with a hundred moons and stars.

The latest scenes naturally describe the most brilliant armor. By uniting two passages, we see at once of what material the pieces of defense, mainly shields, cuirasses, and breastplates, were made. We find them seven in kind: iron, copper, brass, silver, gold, wood, hide. At once the precious may be subtracted from the base metals, as we find them added.[‡]

*Varman* and *kavaca* are the usual names of the body-armor.[§] This is sometimes termed 'body-guard' (*tanutra*, *-trāṇa*), but is elsewhere the particular breast-guard of the whole armor of man or beast, as 'body-guard.' Another name for this is *gātrāvaraṇāni*, 'limb-guards,' distributively, equivalent to the collective.[‖]

---

[*] iii. 37. 19; x. 7. 52, *kavacī satalatrāṇo baddhagodhāṅgulitravān*, and *dhanuṣpāṇir baddhagodhāṅgulitravān*. In the first, C. reads *tanutrāṇo*, 1474.

[†] *kāñcanavarmabhṛt*, ix. 32. 64; i. 30. 47.

[‡] *kārṣṇāyasaṁ varma hemacitram*, vii. 127. 17; *tāmra-rājata-lāuha, lāuhāni kavacāni*, iv. 62. 4, 7; gold especially, ix. 32. 63; wood, *kīlakavacāni* (see above); hide, *dvīpicarma-avanaddha*, *vyāghracarma*, vi. 46. 31: compare above, p. 226, note, on arms. The cuirass is occasionally expressly stated to be very costly: vii. 165. 29, *hemacitram mahādhanaṁ kavacam.*

[§] *çarāvara(ṇa)*, 'arrow-guard,' may be anything that protects the body from arrows, as shields, helm, breastplate, or quiver. As shields, perhaps, in vi. 60. 17; vii. 14. 72.

[‖] viii. 27. 33; vi. 119. 4, *saviçīrṇatanutrāṇaḥ*, all his armor was pierced; vi. 95. 47, *varmamukhyaṁ tanutrāṇam*; *gātrāvaraṇāni* in vii. 2. 28 (*kavacāni*, N.: shields, P. W.); *kaṅkaṭa*, elephant-hook, may mean cuirass in vii. 187. 47. Compare *çarma varma ca* in vii. 117. 28.

Specific ornamentation is found in the rich descriptions of the fourth book. The armor is here adorned with suns and moons, etc.[*] In this passage, and *passim*, the cuirass is lauded as impregnable; the *nivātakavaca*, 'invulnerable plate,' is always assumed. But the knights are in reality perpetually unharnessed (*akavaca*), from the armor being either hewn off or becoming loose.[†]

*Varman*, generally iron, and *carman*, leather armor, are often mentioned together.[‡] Of metals, by far the commonest is iron. Of hide, we find a bull's hide, and loose bear-skins (with a brass breastplate), but the latter are generally for shields. Netted armor or wire netting may be meant in *jāla*, which is adorned with gold and worn by beasts and men.[§] *Varman* means 'cover,' and *carman* 'skin.' Hence *varman* may often imply *carman*. The fixed phrase *khaḍgaṁ carma tathā gṛhya* seem to point to the hide-shield as earlier—an a priori commonplace. As the Yavanas are expressly noted for wearing brass and iron breastplates carefully worked,[‖] it is interesting to observe that even these are said to be of such fragile nature as to be easily pierced by a mass of arrows drawn full to the ear.

Next to the *varman* and *kavaca* comes the shield, called *carman*, which is of leather adorned with figures (vi. 54. 26 ff.); or a simple tiger-skin or bear-skin worn over the body besides the brazen breastplate served as a shield. The shield (that is, here a real shield, worn as a plate) might have as many as three bosses according to the pseudo-Epic, but not in earlier portions.[¶] I judge, perhaps from too slight evidence, that the shield of the chariot-knight was not worn from the beginning of battle, but rested in his car, and was grasped when it came to sword-fighting. First, it seems impossible that a knight should use a bow with even a little shield tied to his arm; and second, we find that a knight who performs the usual act of quitting the bow and the chariot is described as 'drawing his sword and seizing his shield,' which must, therefore, have lain waiting in the car.* I have no passage to prove that the little bells adorning the spears are also found on the shield, though I am not sure that such shields may not be mentioned. The custom is well known to the Greeks (Aeschylus, Septem, 385).

---

[*] iv. 31. 11. The various royal *tanutrāṇi* are gilded iron with images of suns, circles, eyes, etc.; the size of one specified is the area of one hundred water-lilies, or these were marked on it—I am not sure which meaning is correct: *utsedha* seems to me the outer surface raised, so that we might suppose the lilies were in relief. But N. takes it as 'one hundred padmas broad,' as if a shield were meant: this in *varma* is possible; but here we have *kavacam*. Arjuna wears a *sparçarūpavat kavacam*, iii. 168. 75.

[†] *vimuktayogyakavacāḥ*. By arrows the *kavaca* is pierced, vi. 112. 26, *et passim*. Compare R. vi. 68. 19, *tasya tadbāṇavidhvastaṁ kavacaṁ kāñcanam mahat, vyaçīryata rathopasthe tārājālam ivā 'mbare.* But *abhedyāiḥ kavacāir yuktāḥ* is common praise: e. g. iii. 93. 27.

[‡] vii. 148. 40; i. 194. 7.

[§] *jāla, jālavant*, vi. 19. 30: *vāraṇāh. . . çūrā hemamayāir jālāir dīpyamānā ivā 'calāḥ.* Compare R, vi. 64. 24, *sa saṁnaddhaḥ çarī khaḍgī kavacī hemajālavān.* Compare *rukmajāla* for knights, v. 155. 10.

[‖] 'The Overthrow of the Yavanas,' vii. 119. 42, 49: *çāikhyāyasāni* (is as usual damascened: compare xii. 98. 20, but N. here *çoṇitāyomayāni*) *varmāṇi kāṅsyāni ca.*

[¶] *carma trikūṭam*, xii. 166. 51 ff. As *carmāṇi* are differentiated from *phalakāni* in xii. 100. 9, I prefer to take *phalaka* here and in x. 8. 59 as 'sword.' The latter passage makes it worn on the left side (*savye saphalike*). The Petersburg Lexicon translates 'schild' in both passages; N. in B. is silent.

The helmet (*çirastrāṇa*, 'head protector', with the *kirīṭa*, as part for whole) is represented to be of metal and adorned with gems, chiefly the diamond; but, though often spoken of, I can get no definite idea of it, from the lack of description in the Epic. It is worn over the ear-rings (R. vi. 78. 16). The little towers called *nirvyūhas* figure apparently as helmets, and must have been (in accordance with the name, which is elsewhere applied to the real towers of a city) high head-pieces, perhaps a kind of tiara; but they are essentially practical, not ornamental. The commentator defines the word as a weapon. There was a band of cloth, turban, called *uṣṇīṣa* or *veṣṭana*, which was worn with the helmet. I hence suppose that the turban was wound around the sides of the head to guard what a not very well made helm left unprotected.† But often the turban is the only head-gear.

The head with helm and earrings 'looks like a full moon'; but the general brilliancy of ornament, not the shape of the head-piece, must be the tertium (viii. 51. 13). Brazen, *kāṅsya*, implies brass used quite as much for adornment as for use;

---

* vi. 90. 40, *vikṛṣya ca çitaṁ khaḍgaṁ gṛhītvā ca çarāvaram.*

† *Çirastrāṇa* is of gold, iv. 55. 57; ix. 32. 63 (*jāmbūnadapariṣkṛtam*); viii. 21. 27 (*susaṁnaddhāḥ kavacinaḥ saçirastrāṇabhūṣaṇāḥ*); xi. 18. 18 (*çīrṣatrāṇāni*). *Nirvyūha* with the sword (*sanirvyūhāḥ sanistriñçāḥ*), vii. 89. 17; v. 19. 4. *Uṣṇīṣa* with the helmet (*soṣṇīṣaṁ saçirastrāṇam . . [çiras] apātayat*), viii. 54. 28. I do not see the point in the comparison *uṣṇīṣa-kamaṭha* of vii. 99. 52. Perhaps the turban kept the shape of the head (turtle-shaped in the parallel), and was stiff enough to be a real aid to the *çirastrāṇa*. I know from the Epic nothing of the make-up of the turban except that it was perhaps made of three pieces of cloth sewed together (*uṣṇīṣavān yathā vastrāis tribhir bhavati saṁvṛtaḥ*, xii. 217. 12; *sūcyā sūtraṁ yathā vastre saṁsārayati vāyakaḥ*, ib. 36.) Such silly metaphors as that mentioned above abound. Another in *kavacoḍupa*, vii. 14. 10, may represent the *kavaca* not as breastplate simply, but as really fitted to the curves of the body—boat-like in shape on the ground. The only good figure in the scene above (vii. 99, in verse 53) is where Arjuna is the coast (*velābhūta*) against which this ocean of warriors surges.

and it is quite possible, therefore, that mention of brazen arms must be classed in the same category as that of golden.[*]

Rājendralāla Mitra (Indo-Aryans, i. 327) asserts that vizors were worn, quoting in corroboration only that when Droṇa fell, he lifted his vizor, and Arjuna shot him. But, in the case (not cited) that I suppose to be here referred to, Droṇa sits on the chariot-seat, and Arjuna calls out not to kill him. He is however decapitated. The account is repeated by an eye-witness. I find no vizor mentioned in either passage, or elsewhere.[†]

But if vizors are not worn, we find an armor-piece called the 'neck-protector,' which must have formed a defensive union with the helmet above and the corselet below. In a passage quoted above, a knight is described as arrayed in a strong iron gilded breastplate and a neck-protector, while wearing at the same time clothes of yellow, red, white, and black.[‡] That this neck-protector did not amount to much may be seen from the fact that, though worn, it never guards a blow, and from the fact that the sword enters or 'digs into' the neck.[§]

The hand-protectors (*aṅgulivesṭaka*, etc.) are of minor importance. They appear to be of constant use, and, properly, are a defense not so much against the foe as against the knight's own weapons. For their purpose was to protect arm (*godhā*) and finger from the bow-string. They are called hand-guards and finger-guards, and are made of iguana-skin. All the bowmen are represented as wearing them.*

---

[*] Except of course where *kāṅsya* means a brass thing; 'brass and gold' are as noble metals put parallel, as *kāṅsyaṁ ca hāimaṁ ca sarvam*, viii. 2. 29.

[†] vii. 192. 63–68; 193. 63–65. Beneath the helmet or turban the hair was bound; it was a sign of fear to wear it loose, and we often find *muktakeçā vikavacāḥ*, 'with hair and corselet loosed,' as a sign of flight, as in vi. 73. 40. There seems to be no difference between the Epic and the Rāmāyaṇa in respect of wearing the hair. There were always family and sectarian differences in cutting and braiding, but the warriors seem in battle to keep the hair tied about the head. Arjuna only when pretending to be a eunuch wears his hair in long braids (*veṇīkṛtaçiras*, iv. 2. 27). In R., *ekaveṇīdharatvam*, wearing one braid, is a woman's sign of grief (R. v. 22. 8), and grief and discomfort are indicated by wearing long hair in a man's case, R. ii. 28. 23. Curly hair, *vellitāgra*, is admired. It was also a woman's sign of grief to pull out the hair and cover the face (*lulucuḥ keçān kroçantyuḥ*, etc., ix. 29. 69: cf. ib. 63. 68). The Aryans were marked by their beards, as *vadanāiḥ kḷptaçmaçrubhiḥ* is a common addition when telling how the corpses on the battle-field look (viii. 58. 33, etc.). The Purāṇas borrow from a common Epic threat, vii. 119. 26, and denote defeat by a change in wearing hair (*muṇḍa* as epithet: cf. Vāyu P. ii. 26. 138 ff.; Bṛhannār P. viii. 39). To shave a warrior's head is not allowed, xii. 23. 47.

[‡] vii. 127. 16 ff. Here *kavacī* followed by *varma*; the knight wears also hand-guards, earrings, and arm-rings (*aṅgada*); and, as these are conspicuous, the helmet and arm-armor must have been such as to leave both places exposed. *Kaṇṭhatrāṇa* is neck-guard; *kaṇṭhasūtra*, necklace, *passim*.

[§] R. vi. 55. 11 gives a good illustration: *karāt tasya tataḥ khaḍgaṁ samācchidya . . tasyā 'tha galake khaḍgaṁ nicakhāna*. So the head is always cut off at a blow, as here in vs. 18, implying a poor guard.

Signs that this armor, common as it is, is not present in all cases, and that the bow-string marks were a common feature, remain in the epithets applied to warriors, implying that their arms were scarred from the bow-string. Nevertheless, the bow-string-guard is very old. Probably, therefore, it was confined to the fingers.† The noise made by this part of the armor struck by the bow-string is often brought forward.‡

As amulets were much worn and esteemed, we may add their characteristic use under the head of protective armor. The use passes into that of the divine arms, already noted. Such arms are restricted in application. One 'must not be used against the teacher,' etc. Of pure amulets, a single instance may here suffice. A 'gem of power' is spoken of: 'never shall I give it up,' says the knight; 'for, when I bind it on, I have no fear of what can come by weapon, disease, or hunger from god or devil or snake.'§ Bhīshma's golden girdle was perhaps more for ornament than for defense. Such half-ornamental, half-protective additions to the knightly equipment are of course common.‖

### Remarks on the use of magic in war, and on the meaning of the 'science of weapons.'

As an appendix to the subject of weapons and armor, a few words should be said here in regard to a point touched upon in the foregoing paragraph—I mean, the application of the supernatural in war. This subject can scarcely be discussed without a prefatory word on the Epic meaning of the 'science of weapons.' Both these topics have been occasionally alluded to in the preceding sections; but, at the risk of some repetition, I shall here take a collective view of what the Epic teaches us in this regard.

---

* See above, and compare *baddhagodhāṅgulitrāṇa*, vii. 36. 23; *talatra* with *aṅgulitra* in vi. 106. 24, etc. At the beginning of the first day's battle, all the heroes are *talabaddhāḥ*, vi. 18. 9.

† Compare iii. 43. 24. *jyāçarakṣepakaṭhināu* (*bāhū*), 'arms stiff with the stroke of the arrow and bow-string.' In A. V. we find *hastaghna* meaning 'hand-guard.' The Epic terms this *hastāvāpa* (but *hastavāpa* is an emission of arrows). Compare vii. 165. 28, *hastāvāpa*; iv. 55. 54, *hastāvāpin* (N. *hastatrāṇaṁ tadvān*). In xiv. 77. 21, *papāta gāṇḍīvam āvāpaç ca karād api* (the form would be *karāvāpa*), we have not a simple 'armband,' but defensive gauntlet, as usual. The usual *aṅgulitra* or *-trāṇa*, in vii. 41. 16; 44. 14; viii. 19. 40; 58. 22 (*sāṅgulitrāir bhujāgrāiḥ*); iv. 5. 1, *godhā*, etc.; also *cārutalin* (*tala*), iv. 53. 9 (N. *hastāvāpa*); while *karavāla*, i. 30. 49; v. 19. 3, etc., is sword.

‡ viii. 21. 15, *jyātalatradhanuḥçabdaḥ*: compare ib. 23. Compare also vi. 45. 3–4, *āsīt kilakilāçabdas talaçaṅkharavāiḥ saha, . . talatrā 'bhihatāç cāi 'va jyāçabdāḥ.*

§ x. 15. 28 (with *vīryamaṇiḥ* compare *ālabhya vīrakāṅsyam . . utsaṅge dhanur ādāya saçaram*, vii. 112. 63). The divine weapon quoted above, *astram . . na kathaṁ cana prahartavyaṁ gurāv iti*, vii. 147. 25. See below, Magic.

‖ iv. 66. 4, *hiraṇyakakṣaḥ*. But this common *kakṣā* may have been used as a sword-belt.

We find that certain heroes are credited with a special knowledge in certain kinds of fighting, or that in different kinds the heroes are equally expert. For each sort there is a *çikṣā* or special art (vii. 112. 20 ff., *çikṣā*, ib. 31). The combination of all these arts makes the *dhanurveda*, in its general and widest sense. Properly the 'knowledge of the bow,' as the bow becomes a type of all weapons, the knowledge becomes generalized, and *dhanurveda* is equivalent to the science of weapons. Such is the meaning when one says 'in the *dhanurveda* no one is my equal' (viii. 74. 54). But it is not impossible that this collected science became incorporated as a work. In many passages, where *dhanurveda* is set parallel to literary works, such seems to be the interpretation. Nevertheless, the Epic story itself gives no reason for believing that a work of this kind is meant. For, if we examine more closely, we see that the science was one gained by a magical gift or by physical exertion, not by mental application, except in so far as religious meditation be so considered. In what the 'skill' consisted may be seen by a few illustrations. 'Lightness of hand' is the 'art' that is learned in wielding weapons; 'the art of seizing weapons' is taught and acquired. 'Lightness and cleverness' constitute the 'skill.' 'How to mount a war-car' is a point taught here; so also how 'to leap down,' 'to run,' 'to leap easily,' 'to discharge weapons simultaneously,' 'to advance and retreat.' These are what are taught by the science of weapons.*

In all this the *dhanurveda* is no more than a more comprehensive *astraçikṣā*, or art of missiles (vi. 118. 21), and was probably at first confined to this. We even find a man spoken of as a paragon of learning 'in the *dhanurveda* of missiles and the *brāhma veda*' (science of holiness).† When this science of weapons was extended to the chariot, and the knight was taught to 'circle' with his war-car, then the *rathaçikṣā* or 'skill with the chariot' became also a part of the *dhanurveda*. Such skill consists in doubling and returning, and, negatively, in not being made *viratha*, 'deprived of one's war-car,' and not allowing it to be splintered to pieces by the enemy's arms. For each knight, whether he had or had not a charioteer, was able to manage his own war-car.

---

* The heroes are 'supplied with the strength of skill' (vii. 45.17, *çūrāḥ çikṣābalopetāḥ*). 'Lightness of hand' is *pāṇilāghava* (vi. 74. 10; 82. 37; 90. 42, etc.); 'the knowledge of seizing weapons, *çastragrahaṇavidyāḥ*, pl. (vi. 76. 7; vii. 114. 4); 'lightness and cleverness' *lāghava* and *sāuṣṭhava* (ix. 22. 16; vii. 142. 38: cf. 169. 3); 'mounting,' *āroha*; 'leaping down,' *paryavaskanda*; 'running,' *saraṇa*; 'leaping easily,' *sāntarapluta*; 'discharging simultaneously,' *samyakpraharaṇa*; 'advance and retreat,' *yāna vyapayāna*, vi. 76. 8. Compare R. vi. 69. 30 ff.

† *astrāṇām ca dhanurvede brāhme vede ca pāragaḥ*, vii. 23. 39.

In the use of armor, the 'skill' consisted in making it invulnerable. This skill is taught by word of mouth. Especially Droṇa is famous for this: 'he knew how to instruct one to wear the breastplate so that it should be invulnerable.'*

The *dhanuḥ* or bow becomes thus generalized. Vishnu has 'bearing the bow and knowing the bow' as a title of respect.† All weapons are included in the name. It embraces all fighting-knowledge.‡ From this extent it fell into four recognized divisions,§ according to the arms taught, or methods of using them.‖ Only the name Veda, (or *upaveda*, as it was more properly called) betokens a literary existence for this science.¶ But when in the Epic one studies this Veda, he does not repeat it as he does the others; he does not 'go over,' it, and learn it as a memorized work. He goes out and 'studies' it by secreting himself and practicing with his arms till he is proficient; or he gets a teacher to show him how to use his weapons; or, in one case, he makes a fetish-image of the great master.** The great teacher, Droṇa, instructs in the 'art of war' (*raṇaçikṣā*), in club-fight, in 'mixed-fighting' (*saṁkīrṇayuddha*), in sword-fighting, etc.††

Like all other knowledge, this science had its mystical side. As a Veda, it is distinguished from the four great Vedas, but incorporates into itself the outlying mysteries of arms.* This 'mystery' of the science is nothing but the less known tricks in use, and the pretended power over the supernatural. The four divisions are only the divisions of weapons, or else the divisions of use. It is noteworthy that the commentator prefers the last, but admits the first. The original meaning is evidently simply that of method, not of kind. Even when not expressed, such a division is sometimes implied. Thus, we read 'and no one saw Arjuna when he took the arrow in hand, or when he laid it on the bow, or when he discharged it, or when he drew the bow' (iv. 62. 22). Such as these were the original 'four divisions in the science of the bow,' and with bow generalized the form also became extended.

---

* *kavacadhāraṇā . . upadiṣṭā tāṁ eṣa nikhilāṁ vetti*, with *abhedya* as invulnerable, vii. 48. 27; *varma bhāsvaram*, ib. 103. 17.

† *dhanurdharo dhanurvedaḥ*, xiii. 149. 105.

‡ Thus, in i. 139. 6, 17 it embraces knowledge of fighting with club, sword, car, bow, arrow, and missiles.

§ i. 130. 21, *caturvidho dhanurvedaḥ çāstrāṇi vividhāni ca;* iii. 37. 4; v. 158. 3; ix. 44. 22, etc., *catuṣpādo dhanurvedaḥ*.

‖ Compare iii. 115. 45, *kṛtsno dhanurvedaç caturvidhāni cā 'strāṇi;* xi. 23. 27, *astraṁ caturvidhaṁ veda*. Compare above, p. 179., note.

¶ ii. 11. 32–33. We have here, following the four Vedas, *sarvaçāstrāṇi, itihāsa, upavedāḥ, vedāñgāni*. Compare in R. v. 32. 9 *dhanuvede ca vede ca vedāñgeṣu ca niṣṭhitaḥ*.

** Good examples of skill in shooting are given in the tournament, i. 138, and just before in the case of *çabdavedhitvam*, i. 132. 42, where a man sees a dog, and (40) *tadā tasyā 'tha bhaṣataḥ çunaḥ sapta çarān mukhe, lāghavaṁ darçayann astre mumoca yugapad yathā*. This Ekalavya had made an earthen idol of Droṇa, the best teacher of the art of shooting, and worshiped it (i. 132. 33). There is a word in ib. 133. 5 that should be the keynote of good archery—Arjuna's reply to Drona, *paçyāmy ekaṁ bhāsam:* he could see nothing but his target. In i. 131. 42, Ekalavya had left home 'for the sake of practice,' *iṣvastrahetoḥ*. He thus acquires *astravidyā*, ib. 132. 13, 14, 34–35.

†† Compare i. 109. 19; also xi. 23. 32, for the lamentation over this 'knower of the Veda and of weapons.' He is represented as a warrior-priest.

The art of weapons is 'laid in' a person. One receives it as a gift. Thus, Rukmin receives the 'Veda of the bow with its four divisions' (v. 158. 3). But this presentation of the science belongs with the supernatural power used in divine weapons. This Veda must be studied, but the study is done by practice: as where, in Arjuna's case, one goes out and practices even at night, and so learns the art or science of managing horse and elephant, etc. (i. 132. 28).

The ultimate expansion of the theory of weapons resulted in the theory of war, and this was expanded again into a theory of polity; and we thus have on the one side our modern *nīti-çāstra* or 'system of royal polity,' and on the other the practical instruction in the use of arms or the 'science of weapons.' Thus, in a late book we read: 'he will comprehend the science of weapons, and the different weapons, and the system of polity.'† A system of war is implied when we read, for example, of the 'system of Uçanas,' 'the system of Angiras' son,' etc.‡

---

* *Rahasya*, the mysteries, i. 130. 65 ff. It is on a par with the other Vedas in importance for a warrior: *sāṅgā vedā yenā 'dhītāḥ, yasmin sākṣād dhanurvedaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ*, vii. 198. 1. In xiii. 2. 8; 30. 9, *dhanurvedaḥ* and *vedaḥ* are opposed (cf. ib. 56. 7). 'The four Vedas and fourfold Dhanurveda,' or the 'Vedas, Upanishads, and Dhanurveda,' is the usual separation. In ix. 44. 21–22, *dhanurvedaç catuṣpādaḥ çastragrāmaḥ sasaṁgrahaḥ* comes after *vedaç caturmūrtiḥ*. In iii. 99. 59, Vedas, Upanishads, and Dhanurveda are opposed.

† xiv. 66. 24. In the later books, the 'system of polity' was so familiar as to be used in proverbs: e. g. *adhītya nītiçastrāṇi nītiyukto na dṛçyate*, 'not everyone that has perused the works of polity is wise in polity': xiii. 164. 7. The Agni Purāṇa gives a *dhanurveda* (in chapter 248 ff.). The account describes the names, lengths, and methods of using various arms, with the proper employment of forces. In ib. 134–135 there is a rather interesting 'battle-wisdom,' calculated to get victory, and consisting of invocations and curses.

‡ In i. 100. 36, a man that is acquainted with all weapons (*sarvāstravit*) is complimented thus: *uçanā veda yac chāstram ayaṁ tad veda sarvaçaḥ, tathāivā 'ṅgirasaḥ putraḥ . . yad veda çāstraṁ tac cā 'pi kṛtsnam asmin pratiṣṭhitam . . sāṅgopāṅgam . . yad astraṁ veda rāmaç ca tad*

The use of magic is properly a subdivision of the general system of war. It belongs originally to the demons, and is an unfailing concomitant of demon warfare.* Such magic is literally 'illusion.' It was then but a step to confer this power on the most pious knights. Any 'art' could be given away, as the horse-lore, *çikṣā*, of Nala is exchanged by will (iii. 77. 17), and so a knight could without effort learn this 'art of the demons.' Perhaps, too, the boomerang-power of *nivartana*, or making a weapon return to the hand, helped augment this belief. But more than this, the Atharva-Veda was instrumental. By its means one could revive the dead, make a person appear, and do other magical acts. On this side lies pure magic; on the other, the belief in one's magic through his extraordinary skill. Thus, as we saw above, the repetition of a verse over a weapon makes it partake of the supernatural, and gives it more than physical might. There is, however, holy magic and devilish magic. The former is used without scruple by all able to employ it. The latter is condemned, but is employed nevertheless. Its use is restricted to counteracting other devilish magic, for to extirpate a regular magician is a good thing. Good magic is allowed, for the gods use it. Many stories show this. But if one's foe employ no magic, then one should employ no magic.†

The true and usual use of the supernatural is, then, simply to charm a weapon. A hero 'let fly a huge arrow, which flew, terrible, glowing, insupportable even by death, like a piece of

---

*etasmin pratiṣṭhitam.* Compare xv. 7. 15, *çakaṭam padma vajraṁ ca . . uçanā vẽda yac chāstraṁ tatrāi 'tad vihitam*, of the battle-orders contained in Uçanas' code (see above, p. 75 ). In the late didactic portion of the second book, with *sūtra* on horses, elephants, and other war-material, we find the *dhanurvedasya sūtram* and *yantrasūtram* together (ii. 5. 121) as being learned. There seems no reason to doubt that we have here *sūtrāṇi* on various military affairs, and a literary work, the lateness of which is indicated by the context.

* In iii. 20. 33 ff., the demons engage in *māyāyuddha* or a battle of magic. They shower down mountains, clubs, darts, tridents, spears, axes, etc. Compare R. vi. 91. 17 ff.

† The gods use magic, *māyā* or *kriyā*, ix. 31. 8 ff. A king is urged to use it, ib. (*kriyayā yogam āsthāya*). Bad magic is such as Çakuni's (vii. 30. 15 ff., etc.). But *rathamāyā*, vii. 45. 21, is often no more than great skill, ib. 24. The 'delusion' is here physical: compare the 'manœuvres,' which result in 'delusion.' As to killing a magician by good magic, compare ix. 31. 6, *imām māyām māyayā jahī bhārata;* this is *dāivī māyā*, good magic: compare 7, *māyāvī māyayā vadhyaḥ*. Demons, or even half-demons, invent bad magic (vii. 179. 39). *Kṛtyā*, pure witchcraft, is regarded as 'the divinity of witchcraft' by the commentator on vii. 92. 54 (*abhicāradevatā*). The uncanny scene of iii. 251. 23–24 exhibits '*mantra*-magic, declared by Bṛhaspati, Uçanas, and the Atharva-Veda,' for the purpose of making a person appear. The practicer of *abhicāra*, or *abhicārin* (xii. 140. 42), is one conversant with the power of *mantras*, though here used of one that bewitches right to make it wrong (*dharmābhicārin*).

Atharvan (Angiras) witch-craft, saying "may this, my arrow, bring me victory"' (viii. 91. 47). Other magic is of doubtful propriety, except against a trickster. Here the 'eternal law' holds: 'one that employs tricks may be slain'; and 'fight a fair fight; but if magic is used, use magic.' It is often a question discussed with gravity, whether one may employ proper or improper methods of fighting. And here we cannot help seeing the advanced morality of later times.*

In the use of the Atharvan we may distinguish between pure and false magic, as in the use of weapons. Pure magic is where a formula, *kumbha*, empowers a thing to give life or death, as when such a formula vivifies steel. But plant-magic may rest on an older verity. Plants that changed unconsciousness to life, plants medicinally useful—their application is false magic: that is, does not necessarily imply supernatural agencies, though such are pretended.† Medicinal stuff is stored in all the war-cars.‡ A curse alone, purely vocal, is quoted as a 'mind-weapon'; 'by this truth' a knight is slain; this is 'Atharvan magic' pure and simple.§

---

* All divine weapons are *ipso facto* magical. Droṇa and Arjuna do the same with their divine weapons (vii. 188. 33 ff.) as do a pair of demons, each 'skilled in magic,' and showering weapons (vii. 108. 30 ff.; 109. 2 ff.). The real difference is that when a good man uses magic it is right, and when a bad man or a demon uses it, it is wrong. It is holy magic, for example, when Vishnu converts a handful of grasses (*erakāḥ*) into a club (xvi. 3. 36). Of the popular magic, one sort is to become as small as a thumb and then large as the ocean (e. g. vii. 175. 63). The best devilish illusion is made by Rāvaṇa, e. g. iii. 290. 5. The godly illusion may concern itself with such small matters as the sudden appearance of Arjuna's magic ape with a lion's tail, to frighten the foe, iv. 46. 3 (*dāivī māyā*). The rules referred to above are (v. 193. 10) Bhīshma's: 'fight fairly, but use magic against magic'; the 'eternal law,' iii. 12. 7 ('a trickster should be slain'); but, ib. 52. 22: 'it is not called a crime to kill a sinner in a sinful way.' The question of fighting properly (*nyāyataḥ*) or deceitfully (*chadmanā*) is discussed at large before the underhand attempt of Açvatthāman (x. 1. 49 to 6. 21). The fact that this knight entered the camp *advāreṇa* (x. 8. 10) may have given rise to the proverb *advāreṇa ripor gehaṁ dvāreṇa suhṛdo gṛhān praviçanti narā dhīrāḥ* (ii. 21. 53: cf. M. iv. 73). The entrance into the *sabhā* must be *advāreṇa* when the priest is to cure an afflicted child by the hocus-pocus of his trade (expelling the sickness by bell, cymbals, etc.). In general it is a sign that evil is about if one does not go in by the door.

† *viçalyakaraṇī, oṣadhī vīryasampannā*, vi. 81. 10, pure drugs for wounds, false magic. *Vicalyā* is a plant preventing bloodflow. On the other hand, a 'consciousness-weapon' (restoring to life those actually dead) is an instance of pure magic (*prajñāstra*, iii. 289. 5–6). In xiv. 80. 42, Ulūpī finds a *saṁjīvano maṇiḥ* or stone to raise the dead. Compare the *viçalyā divyā* (called *saṁjīvakaraṇī oṣadhī*) of R. vi. 26. 5. Compare *agadā nirvṛtayo vedanāni*, workers of good-luck, and restorers to consciousness, ii. 23. 4 (here half and half).

‡ viii. 89. 70: battle is carried on after an instant cure *mantrāuṣadhībhiḥ*.

§ *astram manasaḥ*, 'weapon of thought,' viii. 90. 82; *satyena*, ib. 91. 47–48; *kṛtyā atharvāngirasī*, ix. 17. 44.

Supernatural also are prognostications. Portents and signs of earth and sky are usually powerful. But often no attention is paid to them. More care is shown for the signs of flying birds, etc., than for earthquake and falling meteors. The positions of wild animals and the acts of any animal are prognostic. The ass's bray is ill-omened. 'The people say it is a sign of defeat if, having eaten little, excrements abound; but let wild deer appear on the left hand, let the horses appear cheerful: that is a sign of victory. Should deer appear coming from the left (on the right), and incorporeal voices be heard, that is a sign of defeat.' So certain kinds of birds augur defeat or victory. The peacock, swan, floater, *cātaka*, are auspicious; but birds of prey, as hawks, herons, cranes; and beasts of prey, as wolves; and flies, and ghosts (*yātudhāna*), imply defeat. 'Drums sound unbeaten' in the army about to conquer; in the other, all is silence but for 'sounds like springs of water, roaring like bulls.' There comes a pure Hindu token to these pan-Aryan signs: 'and it is also a token of defeat if one hates a priest.'

There are in general three sorts of prodigies, of heaven, earth, and atmosphere. As a matter of fact, the ill-omened birds appear all over the field; for the hawk, crow, wolf, and jackal steal their food from the heaps of slain.*

This supernatural of superstition seems to have become more powerful than the supernatural of religion. The new god has not yet his whole power; the ancient gods are passing away. These divinities are degraded, but are still real. It is in the fairy stories of the Epic that the old gods are active. The Sun says to Sāvitrī, 'look, all the gods with Indra at their head sit laughing at me' (iii. 306. 20). But in battle—that is, in the actual Epic—they are visions, they are ghosts of themselves, asleep, spirits; real, but subordinated to the new power. They watch the battle, but take no share in it (viii. 37. 31, etc.). If they take a sudden party interest, they relapse again almost at once, and become dull spectators (viii. 87. 42, 48).

---

* The prodigies of beast and bird occur frequently, and several passages strengthen that quoted above: *pradakṣiṇā mṛgāḥ* . . *jayaliṅgam; apasavyā mṛgāḥ* (and) *vācaḥ* . . *açarīriṇyaḥ* . . *parābhavalakṣaṇam*, v. 143. 14 ff. Compare the evil birds on the right (*apasavyāḥ*), giving fear, in iv. 46. 27; in iii. 269. 7, a jackal coming up to the left side (*vāmam upetya pārçvam*) is an evil omen; in iii. 179. 4 ff., the bad omens are beasts on the right (*apasavyāḥ*); carrion birds behind crying *yāhi* ('go on'); the right arm twitching, the left leg and arm twitching; in v. 138. 21 ff., the meteorological omens: compare end of ib. 158; vi. 2 to 4 (note here, 3. 43, *vāyasāç ca ruvanty ugraṁ vāmam maṇḍalam āçritāḥ*). The drums, etc., of our passage, *anāhatā nadanti paṭahāḥ* (v. 143. 20); 'hating a priest,' ib. 27. Compare further ii. 71. 22–24 (jackals, asses, and birds as omens); ii. 46. 8 (the three kinds of omens, *utpātās trividhāḥ*). The bloody heaps attracting the ravenous, vi. 117. 57; vii. 7. 36 ff.). The Çānti, teeming with supernatural wisdom, gives (in 105. 24; *āuṣadhiyoga* is a foe-killing 'application of poison') in 102. 6 ff. late notes on prognostication. Winds following an army, rainbows, rain in the rear, sunlight, and even jackals and hawks, if they are favorable in appearance (*anukūla*), ensure success; certain smells and sounds also portend victory. The position is plainly relative, as seen in the following: 'when nice animals are in the rear and on the left during a march, and on the right while the army enters battle, they announce victory; those in front prevent it.' The following birds are lucky: *çakuna, haṅsa, krāuñca, cāṣa;* the general rule reads (15) *iṣṭo vāmaḥ praviṣṭasya dakṣiṇaḥ pravivikṣataḥ, paççāt saṁsādhayaty arthaṁ purastāc ca niṣedhati.* In R. compare *anuvāti çubho vāyuḥ*, v. 73. 52, and other omens following; birds, in ib. vi. 11 ff.; and all of R. vi. 83.

The forward knight that has penetrated the veil of priestly wisdom learns with awe the secret of the Trinity, of the One All-God. To the mass, to the vulgar, this is mere words. The gods of old are but shadows. 'The god for a warrior is his bow and arrow' (iii. 313. 51 ff.). Owing to this decadence of the old supernatural power, and the not yet thoroughly diffused knowledge of the new faith—for the heroes of the Epic are not so much devout believers as sudden and still inquiring converts—the poem is left in a strangely unreligious condition, so far as the mass of warriors is concerned. The war is intensely human. No convenient gods and goddesses play with their mortal protégés. Each fighter contends supported indeed by a religious hope of reaching Indra's heaven; but there is no Indra to intervene and save him. In this regard there is a marked difference between the Greek and Hindu Epic. Skanda is an impartial abstraction of martial fury: Vishnu is not a god that affects the army; he is, so to speak, a private god of the Pāndus, more particularly of Arjuna. The outsiders are left to their own valor. Each falls alone; no god watches him; no goddess shrouds him in a mist. Duty and Death and Indra far away—these are their gods. All others are but names. 'With all the gods' the boasting knight is not afraid to contend; to him they are unreal; to him even the new god is but a myth of fancy. If he accepts that god and knows him, he has by that acceptance done away with gods; if he rejects him, he has but the shades of gods no longer real. The knight's acts are his own; his reward is his own making; his sin is self-punished. Fate, or the embrace of Death; Duty, or to follow the paths of custom—these are his only moral obligation. His supernatural is understood too little to be true; or it is debased to incantation and witchcraft. The knight of our present poem stands on the border-land between two faiths. He presents a poetic figure unparalleled in Epic poetry. For that very reason, he gains upon the human side.*

---

* Besides the quotations given above, a few extracts from other parts of the work will show to what mere ghosts the ancient *devas* of

### F. Paraphernalia of battle and Music in the Epic.

Under this heading I shall refer to the chief furniture of battle, but shall not seek to give a complete account of all the secondary trappings of the army, as my object is to convey the general impression made by the descriptions of the poem, rather than to be precise in details. We need this general impression, for otherwise we lose the shading of the Hindu artist, and the reality of the Hindu battle-field. The earrings of the knight are as necessary to the picture and to historic truth as are his bow and arrows. From one point of view, these accessories of battle are even more important than the more important factors. Chariots and bows are not national or peculiar, but pan-Aryan, or rather universal. We have only to determine what difference exists between those of the Hindu and other nations. But ornaments and objects of vanity are (universal indeed also, but) more markedly differentiated. Orient

---

the Hindu had descended, except in tales acknowledged to be of the marvelous. In the war the gods come and look on as mere spectators in vi. 43. 10; joined by all other supernatural beings, in vii. 188. 37; while they are worked up to active life simply through their wonder and astonishment at men's ability in vi. 95. 67 and vii. 124. We find that the Fire-god assists his friend, but not in the war, only in a tale related of one of the heroes (Sahadeva against Nīla), ii. 31. 23. Of like sort are the Arjuna-tales, the ascent to Indra, the burning of Khandava, etc. In the war these gods are openly despised. 'All these warriors protect thee, therefore all the gods can not harm thee,' vii. 87. 15. Karṇa says that 'the gods cannot conquer the Pāndus,' vii. 158. 50; 185. 25. The knight is not afraid to cry out 'the gods cannot overcome me,' vii. 195. 23–24. But the abstract of the personal gods remains; the *devas* are weak, but the *dāivam* is strong. The godly-power, that is the impersonal Fate. Forever we find repeated the formula *dāivam eva param manye dhik pāuruṣam anarthakam*, 'Fate I deem the highest; fie on useless human (effort),' vii. 135. 1; viii. 9. 3, etc. For 'Fate is the norm of good and bad action,' vii. 152. 32. And 'in Fate is victory,' vii. 158. 70. As a side of Fate only is Death, or Yama, who remains real with his realm of horrors (*yamarāṣṭravivardhanaḥ*, of a single man, vi. 89. 28; or of battle, vi. 95. 25). And Duty remains as a god, though often merely the law acknowledged by gods, vii. 156. 2. Such gods are abstractions merely, and convey no more than Krishna's words, which say 'his is the victory who fights in a (legal) manner according to the code' (vi. 43. 24). Most interesting in the light of the removal of the gods from human sympathy is the creation of the ancestral ghost to supply this need. No god gives any word of comfort. But the ancestor of Yudhishthira comes down as a spirit to speak words of sympathy to him, vii. 52. Only in stories and echoes of the past do we find the old gods active and armed, where, while Yama has the rod of death, Varuṇa has the noose and the thunderbolt, and the god of wealth bears the club (i. 227. 32: compare iii. 168. 29, arms of all the gods). It is the ghost of Vyāsa that proclaims *yato dharmas tato jayas*, 'victory is on the side of right,' vii. 183. 67; and he gives the essence of Duty as 'compassion, penance, generosity, mercy, truth,' ib. 64–66. What consolation there is is merely the statement that one should bow to fate and die like a hero, vii. 78; 80. 7 ff.; for, as the proverb says, 'man is the slave of things, not things of man,' vi. 43. 41, 56, 71.

and Occident here stand in more vivid contrast. Each fighter, the world over, bears a weapon; only some wear garlands and necklaces.

Our knight of India was generally a vain and boasting personage.* It must have been with satisfaction that the ignoble heart of Yudhishthira learned that Arjuna was about to miss heaven because he had boasted so much. But in truth it was the sin of all the Hindu warriors. There is not a modest man among them. This verbal display found also its counterpart in outward gaudiness of raiment. Not only were the arms and armor profusely decorated, as we said above, but the heroes also wore in all accoutrements whatever was most brilliant and showy. A barbaric display pervades the poem.

We saw in a quotation given above the ready knight stand armed with bow and breastplate, and wear, besides, rings on his arms and in his ears. Another we saw wearing red, yellow, white, and black clothes. The princes royal are arrayed in red. To these ornaments we must add the garlands with which each knight went into battle; the gems and diamonds worn about the armor, and even set in the common arms; the rings, again, worn upon the fingers; the chains of gold and pearl; the girdles of gold; and the tinkling bells of sword and club and chariot. Many of these—the rings and bands, in particular—are differentiated in Sanskrit without difference for us. Could we get at the true distinctions between these seemingly synonymous names, we should have a yet more bewildering view of the flashing, not to say flashy, magnificence of the Hindu warrior.†

---

* Even when he decries boasting he boasts. An amusing instance R. vi. 67. 15, 'without boasting I shall slay thee; behold my prowess; without talking burn fire and sun,' etc. (*avikatthya*).

† The general furniture of cars, men, horses, elephants, etc., goes under the name of *bhāṇḍa*. For the earrings, besides vii. 127. 16 (above),
compare *mahac chiraḥ kuṇḍalopacitam*, viii. 27. 22; for the garlands, v.
195. 2; and observe that, ib. 196. 20, the foot-soldiers are described as
bearing bows, swords, and clubs, but no ornaments. The poet loves a
horrible antithesis of beauty and blood: 'upon that field of battle lay
many a dissevered head, fair-eyed, with fair ear-rings' (viii. 27. 34: com-
pare vii. 148. 40). The bloody banners and gaudy bloody garments are
vividly described in vii. 34. 15 ff. The different rings and bracelets
(*aṅgada, keyūra, pārihārya*) are mentioned together in v. 162. 16 (com-
pare *parihāṭaka*); with *niṣka, cūḍāmaṇi*, crown-jewels, gems, and gold
in the proper name Rukmāṅgada: compare vii. 148. 29; 41. 16 (*sāṅgadā*
*raṇe*); the wrist-ring, *valaya* (vii. 138. 22), and arm-ring, *keyūra* (vi. 114.
18); add *cakrabāla*, finger-rings. The bells, *ghaṇṭā, kiṅkiṇī*, are
found *passim* (compare above, and the use of *nūpura*, anklets, more
common in R.). The bejeweled turban, *uṣṇīṣa* (besides above, vi. 89. 37;
96. 73; 114. 18, etc.; white, in ib. 20. 9), is worn by all; the *mukuṭa* and
*cūḍāmaṇi*, diadem, head-jewel, seem, however, to be only royal. We
may suppose the old and new mixed here; the later usage, when the
king, free from immediate personal danger, drove upon the scene to

We have to add to all this adornment the fans (*vyajana*), the umbrella (*chattra*, spoken of above), and 'tails' or chowries (*cāmara*), which are in part insignia of royal office, in part mere weak additions to luxury and display.*

Music. We find ourselves here midway between the Vedic and modern text-book period of Hindu development. The musical instruments are in part (in name, at least), the same as those of the earlier age. The modern instruments are in part unknown.

We may say that, in general, the (kettle-)drum, cymbals, and flute are, in time, the most universal instruments. From a passage in the Atharva-Veda it seems that the body of the first was made of wood covered with leather.† No instrument is more common than this in the Epic.‡ The kettle-drum, *dundubhi*, is often mentioned as accompanied by the *bherī*. This last is not a Vedic word. It seems to mean, as the Petersburg Lexicon translates it, a kettle-drum also. In the Rāmāyaṇa it is beaten with a stick. In the Epic is sounds with the fearful sound of bows and horns, and the tumult of war-cars.§ There is one passage that leads me to question whether *bherī* may not be cymbals. In a great fight described in the third book we have an expression, copied again in the fourth, wherein the sound of

---

see, not to fight, permitting a crown instead of the older helmet. Neither word is old. Thus *aṣṭaratnin*, viii. 72. 30, a hero with eight jewels on his head. The neck had a chain (*kanṭhasūtra*) of gold or pearl (*jāmbūnada, hāra*); 'whose diadem was bright with finest jewels' is a royal epithet, iv. 66. 27; vi. 114. 17 ff.; vii. 187. 48 (*hāra, kirīṭa, mukuṭa*, etc.); viii. 27. 30 ff. Of all these, the naturally most common are the bracelets, which stay on the arms, while other gems fall off. 'With gauntlets and with clubs and bracelets in the fight' is a frequent juxtaposition, as in vii. 41. 16.

* For *vyajana* we sometimes find *vālavyajana*. In viii. 24. 60 (*vāladhi*); 27. 33, these are mentioned together with the *cāmara* and arms of war. The ox-tail badge of authority (in viii. 58. 27, *prakīrṇaka* = *cāmara*, N.) was also worn as a crest of horses. Compare *prakīrṇakā viprakīrṇāḥ* with *āpīḍa*, garlands, etc., as adornment of horses, viii. 94. 20. For a general description, compare vii. 34. 20, 'with white umbrella, ox-tail, and fan, the king gleamed like the rising sun.' Compare above, p. 258.

† A.V. v. 20. 1–2; Zimmer, *Alt. Leb.*, p. 289.

‡ Yet Rājendralāla Mitra strangely remarks (after speaking of the drum as an ancient Rig-Veda instrument)—'But Vyāsa in the Mahābhārata does not allude to it. He replaces it by . . . conch-shells . .' (Indo-Ary. i. 329). It is evident that this investigator means here the drum in general, in distinction from the shell, so that it would seem as if a more unfounded statement could not have been made, for drums are mentioned in the Epic as frequently as conch-shells. It also contradicts his own words on p. 284, where the large military drum of the Mahābhārata is spoken of.

§ iv. 46. 12; 62. 3, etc.; vi. 115. 39. In ii. 21. 16, N. translates *bherī* by *dundubhi*. He notes here a Bengal reading of the word *māsatālā*, viz. *māṅsanālā*, and explains this as part of the hide, with which the three drums are made.

the roaring of a hard-pressed combatant is likened to the noise of 'split *bherī*'; and in another place the noise of the bow-string on the two hands is like the noise of (the) two *bherī*. A kettle-drum would hardly give any sound if it were split, whereas fractured cymbals would not ill portray the harsh discordance of cries intended in the comparison. The dual in the last may, however, be merely to parallel the 'two hands.' Elsewhere I find no objection to rendering *bherī* as drum in the Epic, and these passages may not be deemed sufficient to cause us to change. In peace this *bherī* is the alarm-instrument used, for example, by the warder of the assembly to rouse the town: 'he beat the gold-mounted noisy *bherī* that calls to arms.'*

The many kinds of drums and like instruments are shown by groups frequently found, such as this: 'they then brought forth the very loud sound of the *paṇava*, *mṛdaṅga*, *dundubhi*, *krakaca*, *mahānaka*, *bherī*, and *jharjhara*' (vii. 39. 31). To these we may add *peçī*, also a drum, and *puṣkara*, as indefinite, defined the same.†

These all appear to be drums, except perhaps the *mṛdaṅga* and *krakaca*, the former possibly a tambour, the latter said to be a saw. Quite common also is the *muraja*, tambourine, but the drum *paṭaha* is very rare.‡ It is hard to say whether drum or shell be the favored instrument in Epic battle. Noteworthy is, however, the more marked personality of the 'sea-born shell,' the universality of naming it (in vii. 23. 85 we find a rare instance of drums named), and, again, the comparative rareness of horn as against shell. Further noteworthy is the fact that the knight carries a drum as well as a horn. In fact, the liberal fancy of the poet permits a hero to shout his war-cry, beat his drum, blow his horn, and carry his weapons all at once.

---

* iii. 11. 62, *vinadantam mahānādam bhinnabherīsvanam balī bhrāmayāmāsa* . . . almost = iv. 22. 75. Here the one that gives forth the noise is being strangled. iv. 48. 5, *talayoḥ çabdo bheryor āhatayor iva*. i. 220. 11, *bherīṁ sāṁnāhikīṁ tataḥ samājaghne mahāghoṣāṁ jāmbūnadapariṣkṛtām* (*sāṁnāhikīṁ, saṁnaddhāḥ sarve bhavate 'ti sūcayantīm*, N.). The *bherī* (meaning to the Hindu 'the terrible') is sounded by beating, as here and, e.g., vii. 88. 1, *tāḍyamānāsu bherīṣu mṛdaṅgeṣu nadatsu ca pradhmāpiteṣu çaṅkheṣu*, on the drawing out of the army into the field. So R. vi. 31. 28, *bherīm āhatya bhāiravīm* one enters a war-car for battle. Music of all sorts accompanies this, ib. 35. 1 ff.

† vi. 43. 7–8; 99. 17–18.

‡ In iii. 20. 10 read *triḥ samāhanyatām eṣā dundubhiḥ*, not *triḥsāmā 'hanyatām*. The *ānaka* or *mahānaka* (as above) is united to the 'joyous *mṛdaṅga*' in viii. 46. 52. It is the latter instrument for which as a pounder the *yantra* is used, vii. 23. 85. The former is beaten also, and helps the tumult of horns, *bherīs*, and *peçīs*, in vi. 51. 23. My objection to defining *krakaca* as a saw is merely based on its like use, e. g. in vi. 43. 7–8: 'they blew the sea-born shells; and then the *bherīs*, *peçīs*, *krakacas*, and *goviṣāṇikas* were forcibly beaten, so that a great noise arose.' The conch only is blown in vi. 43. 109: 'they beat the great drums (*mahābherīḥ*), and blew the white conchs,' after Mlecchas and Aryans had confusedly shouted (the causal of the verb is occasionally used, *çaṅkham prādhmāpayat*, vi. 54. 85). Accepting the commentator's statement, *bherī* is a large drum, and *goviṣāṇikā* (once feminine) a cow-horn; and this for the last seems certainly the requisite meaning. In vi. 99. 17–19 we find the sound of 'shells, saws, horns (and the five drums), *bherī*, *mṛdaṅga*, *paṇava*, *puṣkara*, *dundubhi*, added to the sounds *kṣveḍa*, *kilakilā*. Compare nearly the same in ib. 44. 4, plus *muraja*, the tambourine. The *muraja* comes again in ib. 58. 46; and the *puṣkara*, in 43. 103. If in the last passage the v. l. registered by N. be correct (*ekapuṣkarān* = *murajān*, for *eva*

The usual instrument for trumpeting was the conch-shell, bearing etymologically the same name, *çañkha*, and carried by each chief. Compare this description: 'then standing on the great car drawn by white horses, he blew in his gold-adorned shell—Arjuna blew in his shell Devadatta; Krishna, the shell that was called Pāncajanya . . .'*

---

*puṣkarān*), we have the 'single-headed-drum' as synonym for *muraja*, tambourine; and therewith the name of the drum-head in general, *puṣkara*. *Jharjhara* (compare Vāyu P. i. 40. 24) might possibly be a corruption of *gargara* (though the latter is stringed), a Vedic musical instrument. The tambourine is united with the lute on the heavenly car of the gods described in the pseudo-Epic (xiii. 106. 62, *muraja* and *vīṇā*). The sounds of these different instruments, as in the specimens above, are frequently imitated. In vii. 154. 25 ff., we find also *phetkāra* (*nirhrāda* of drums), the clanging weapon-sound, *caṭacaṭā;* and here too the rare drum *paṭaha*. In ix. 23. 70, *kaṭakaṭā* gives the sound of men. In vi. 44. 4, we find commingled *kilakilāçabdāḥ* with weapons, and in vii. 36. 17, the shouts *halahalā* with the general instrumental music (*vāditra*); while ib. 38. 12 gives us *hum* as a shout, and the constant 'shout of the lion' as battle-cry. Here also we find *kṣveḍitam*, *utkruṣṭam*, *garjitam*, noises of exhortation to fight—that is, battle-cries. And we notice that they are not idle sounds, for such rout an army at times, e. g. vi. 44. 27. The directions given in the pseudo-Epic are: 'to encourage crowds (in battle) let such noises as these be made, *kṣveḍāḥ*, *kilakilā*, *krakaca*, with horns and drums,' xii. 100. 46, 50. We may translate loosely: 'hissing noises, shouts of hurrah, saw-noises, horns, large battle drums should encourage the army in their advance.' As to the beating, however, we find *āhata* used of shells (e. g. R. vi. 57. 19), so that the instrument is not determined by the participle. One more drum is that called *diṇḍima* in the description of viii. 11. 36–42, at the beginning of the day's battle: 'shells and drums were sounded; the shout of the lion was given; then came the neigh of horses and the war-cars' heavy roll; and wing by wing and flank by flank they moved against the foe, dancing to battle.' In this passage, beside the usual *bherī*, etc., we have the 'din-maker,' *diṇḍima*, a drum. The *paṭaha*, v. 143. 20; (with *bherī*) in vi. 3. 42; R. iv. 38. 34 (with horn). I have noted no other form of Epic drum, except *āḍambara* in iv. 72. 27, marriage fête, with shell and horn, *gomukha*, and vii. 82. 4, with drums mentioned above. In R. vi. 37. 52, *kumbhamukha* seems to be a drum also, if not a bagpipe ('pot-head'). The later word for drum-stick, *koṇa*, is familiar to the Rāmāyaṇa, but not to the Epic.

* vi. 51. 24. The shells of the other Pāndus have also their names given in the same verse. Bhima's is named Pāuṇḍra; Yudhishthira's, Anantavijaya; the twins', Sughosha and Manipushpaka. Compare vii. 88. 22, where the two lovers blow their horns.

The conch-shell was 'fair and gilded and terrible' (viii. 37. 28), and seems to have been used indifferently with the horn, whenever the latter is employed, perhaps only by the vulgar. Its great size is also alluded to.* The musical instruments in general are grouped as *vāditrāṇi*, usually implying drums, though *vāditra* may be a general name for any instrument. For example, in vii. 13. 17, the *vāditrāṇi* are beaten by the Kurus in scornful defiance of the Pāndus' horns; to encourage Karṇa, the Kurus 'beat the *vāditrāṇi* and blew the shells;' while, to encourage Arjuna, the Pāndus 'filled the horizon with the sound of music, drum and shell, amid shouts and clapping of hands.'† Comparing later literature, we shall be inclined to give the later preference to drums rather than to trumpets, judging by the names. A number of new instruments, *ṭaṅku*, *ḍamaru* (with *kheṭaka*), *ḍamarukā*, etc., meets us in the Puranic period.‡ The camp-music differs slightly from the battle-field music; for though the battle-melodies are heard, they are softened; and when at sundown the armies return to camp, they are greeted by the milder notes of the lyre mingling with the war-instruments. Of this lyre more anon.§

On the commonness of shouting and congratulation and other noises I need not dwell. As heroes fight duels very often while 'all the world' stands and looks on, we expect to hear 'praise and loud rejoicing resounding' at the cessation of the struggle, when one is killed.* The usual sounds that are, as it were, rung in one's ears at once, with the quick and nervous style of the delineator, leave on the reader's mind a general impression that the whole battle, from dawn or sunrise to sunset, is filled with the rumble of car-wheels, the ringing of hoofs, the undistinguished cries of men, the neighing of horses, shrieks of elephants, clapping of hands, tinkling of bells, clatter of steel weapons, twanging of bow-strings, beating of drums, blowing of shells and horns, yells of agony, shrieks, shouts of warning, curses, bravos, the thud of falling bodies, and—clearest of all, widest-sounding—the battle-signals and war-cries that never stop till some great hero falls; then comes a moment's pause, but only for a moment, until in renewed shrieks of fear and joy and all the noise that was for a second hushed, the universal uproar again begins.†

---

* Compare above, iv. 72. 27, *gomukha*, *çaṅkha*, and *āḍambara*. Compare *ḍiṇḍibha* (sic) and *çaṅkha* in xii. 282. 41. Each his own drum and trumpet and bow (and battle cry), vii. 127. 28. With kissing and blowing of shells heroes salute each other, viii. 94. 59. In viii. 58. 27, *mahāçaṅkha*. *Gomukha* is perhaps paralleled by *durmukha* in Mṛcch. Act vi., though it is not certain that the things here mentioned are drums at all.

† *Vāditrāṇi*, the 'sounding' things, are then, generally, percussive musical instruments; and *tūrya*, their sound. The terms for the instrument and music are occasionally interchanged, so that *vāditra* means music, and *tūrya* what makes it. Thus the *tūryanināda* in vii. 159. 37, though here joined to the 'lion's-roar' (battle-cry), may be an instrument: compare vii. 19. 20; and in iv. 65. 15, *na te 'dya tūryāṇi samāhatāni* (N. *jayavādyāni*), where *tūryāṇi* seems to me to be instruments. Compare in other literature the *yāmyatūrya* and *mṛtyutūrya*, a metal instrument beaten like a drum, So we might say in iii. 43. 11 'congratulations (*āçīrvāda*) with *divyavāditra*' implies music or instruments, as beside are shells and drums.

‡ Compare Ag. P. 43. 27; 50. 2, 8; 51. 24, 31 ff., etc. The offensive armor is kept more conservatively in the Purāṇas than the defensive, or the instruments of music.

§ The *vīṇā* with joyful *tūrya*, as well as drum and horn, is the evening music of vii. 72. 11 ff., and thereto comes the *āḍambara*-drum and 'songs of victory.' *maṅgalyāni gītāni*. The music of the tournament, 'a sea of music' (*tūryāugha*), may be compared with this, i. 185. 18 et circ. The commentator using *tūryarava* (with *āḍambara*) reminds us that the *siṅhanāda* or battle-cry of 'the lion-sound' has become technical enough to need *rava* added—the sound of the 'noise of the lion,' *siṅhanādarava*, vii. 18. 2.

Of much interest is the question of the application of music outside of war. For this not only involves larger social relations, but, in so doing, touches upon the first origin of the Epic itself. The Epic arose, as it seems to me, from two distinct sources and castes—music and narration, warrior-bard and priest. We may then broaden the question somewhat, and, going back of the problem to which an answer was attempted in the Introduction, enquire not only whence our present Epic has come, but further, how the general Epic form first arose. Our question is this: what *ποῦ στῶ* in the poetry of their fathers had the first Epic poet or poets—what leverage to raise such a world as a military historical poem?

The possible origin of military poetry was long ago pointed out by Weber. I shall review what he has told us, and then seek to find what the Epic itself suggests as to the conditions under which poetry and music could be united with tales. War-poetry mingles, even in the Rig-Veda, with strictly religious hymns. The overthrow of un-Aryan peoples, even that of Aryan neighbors, is made the subject of a triumphal lyric.

---

* vii. 156. 142; vi. 113, 20; 114. 34 (*sarvalokasya paçyataḥ sarvasāinyasya*).

† Bells, vii. 148. 47; viii. 19. 45 (see individual arms, above); v. 196. 29; either *ghaṇṭā* or *kiṅkiṇī*. The women's belled girdles of the Rāmāyaṇa are, I believe, not mentioned in the Epic (*kāñcī*: cf. R. v. 20. 16). Handclapping: compare *talaçabdam mahat kṛtvā taṁ samupādravat*, vii. 16. 36. Variations are *talatāla*, *tālaçabda*. A ghastly comparison in ix. 9. 18 makes the sound of heads falling to earth like the noise of nuts falling from a palm-tree. In vii. 187. 14 (a useful paragraph for battle-noise), the sounds are likened to 'the noise of those engaged in the washing of clothes;' or to 'the roar of ocean,' in vii. 39. 31. The chariot-noise is made by the metal tire, *nemi*, *pramaṇḍala*, and is joined to the hoof-sound (*nemikhurasvana*, *rathanemisvara*), ix. 9. 14-15, and likened to thunder. The *jayaçabdāḥ* occur independently on all occasions. as in ix. 6. 22, etc. They are encouraging shouts, battle-cries; the *āçīrvādāḥ* are wishes for a good day, or congratulations.

In the first beginnings of prose, we find among the rules in regard to the proper sacrificial ceremonies one rule that touches on the singers of military songs, and explains what should be the subject of their lays: a musician of the military caste shall (at this point in a religious ceremony) sing an original song; the song shall have for a subject 'this king fought, this king conquered in such a battle.' As Weber points out, these lays were assumed to be historical. They have, although employed in religious rite, not a religious but a secular origin—a circumstance that reminds us that the Epic was said to have been repeated at a great sacrifice as a secular diversion, and that to this day the Epic-recitations are given on such occasions (compare Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 580). These lays, again, do not pretend to inspiration, but are the improvised verses of a minstrel belonging not to the priestly but to the military caste, as even some of the Vedic songs are accredited to members of the same caste. These verses are sung by the musician to a musical accompaniment in honor of the king who gives the sacrifice, or rather in honor of him and of his ancestors. The subject is, again, the battles fought and the victories won by these kings. We find, not one, but a band (*gaṇa*) of musicians singing the deeds of old heroes, and accompanying themselves on the lyre (*vīṇā*), and called *vīṇāgāthin* (lyre-singer).* Weber remarks that the laudatory side must have been developed at the cost of the historical, for the laudation was often so fulsome as elsewhere to be called 'lies.'† Fragments of such songs are preserved in the Brāhmaṇas, and choruses of singers revert to the Rig-Veda period. Antedating all but the Vedic hymns, we find as earliest product of what we may term literature (outside of the ritual) tales of heroes and gods, sometimes metrical, sometimes in prose. These are due to priestly wit. Now, combining such legend with the military lays that referred to more recent events, we have a union of legend and song, of the literary priestly and the dramatic military element. Did this happen, did the priest steal the military song and combine it (no longer as musical product, but as recitation) with his older legend, did he write a poem that embraced the deed of the present hero and the legend of his race, we should have an Epic of which the foundation must have been at once historical and legendary, military and priestly.

Weber's position on this point is not quite clear. In his Literature, pp. 200–201, he seems to consider the legends the chief factor, and the Gāthās as secondary. In Indian Antiquary, ii. 58, he says that the Mahābhārata has 'grown out from the songs of the minstrels at the courts of the petty *rājas*.' Lassen, laying bare all as additions to the legends, counts the tales as the real origin, simply pointing out three kinds: the first, simple tales (Ādi, condensed Bhārata); next, tales of instruction (Çānti); last, the long legends (Vana). The difference between the Bhārata and Great Bhārata—expressed in the romantic tone of the latter, which brings it near to the prevailing spirit of the Rāmāyaṇa—has been clearly pointed out by Schroeder.* Müller, in Ancient Sanskrit Literature, pp. 36, 37, 40, will not 'deny that a mass of popular songs celebrating the power and exploits of gods and heroes existed at a very early period in India,' but says we must seek them in the Veda, not in the Epic. He shows immediately, however, that 'Epic poetry, traditional as well as improvised on the spur of the moment,' existed during the Vedic age, and that the Vedic traditions were not forgotten in after time, when the priests 'began to collect all the remains of Epic songs into one large body called the Mahābhārata.' That Epic legend existed long before the recognized Epic period has of late been shown by Bradke and Oldenberg. From the investigations of these scholars it would appear that the 'prosaic-poetic' legend is of Vedic antiquity. But the 'poetic' element is purely lyric.† I cannot allow that the recitative form was older, or was the exclusive source of the poem. The Epic is itself significant of its partial origin from lays. The cloudiness reigning in the battle-scenes between the acts of special heroes, and the catch-word phrases that always link these separate scenes together, seem to show that they have been united by a later clumsy hand: not perhaps the scenes as we have them in their present fullness, but the different exploits subsequently developed into those scenes. Take any of the battle-books, and open at random. We find a succession of duels and single feats, ending always in the same way: 'then it was terrible,' 'then there arose a great tumult,' 'then he seized another bow,' 'then everyone shot at everyone,' 'then there was an indistinguishable fight.'‡ We sail through a general indistinct warfare described in stock phrases, and soon come again on a duel, where individuals and separate deeds of heroism are plainly given. Each of these encounters is and was a unit, composed by a 'hero-praiser.' How early the 'hero-praisers' recite their old tales may be seen by Çat. Br. xiv. 5. 4.

---

* Çat. Br. xiii. 4. 3. 3 and 5; Weber, I. S. i. 187.

† Weber. Z.D.M.G. xv. 136; Zimmer, *Alt. Leb.*, p. 170.

---

* Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 1004. Schroeder, *Lit. u. Cult.*, p. 456.

† Compare Z.D.M.G., xxxvi. 474, Bradke; xxxvii. 54 ff., xxxix. 52 ff., Oldenberg.

‡ Compare in short compass viii. 48. 40; 50. 40; 52. 30; 84. 21; 93. 50; ix. 23. 70, 79, etc.

10; Āçv. G. S. iii. 3. 1. But the musical side is prominent beside the narration. 'Sing ye the king or some other braver hero' is the command given to the two lute-players in the course of the ritual (Pār. G. S. i. 15. 7). The *snātaka* or twice-born householder is forbidden by the same authority to dance or play music, and song is deprecated (ii. 7. 3).*

The parallel between a lyric origin for much of our Epic and the Wolfian κλέα ἀνδρῶν, between the kitharode and the *vīṇāgāthin*, can scarcely be called forced, and we have no right to ignore it. The well-developed music of the Vedic period; the kitharode equally besinging soma and the king; the mention of a harp of a hundred strings, *çatatanti;* the congregational singing (*vāṇasya saptadhātur ij janaḥ*, R. V. x. 32. 4), show us that a lyrical beginning is probable, and that not of a late, but of an early period.

But the most striking difference between the early and the late praiser is this, that at first the profession was full of honor; priests and kings' sons sang to the heroes' honor. But the praiser became a lying sycophant. Honor left the occupation. The priests no longer made new songs for new kings; they had embodied the old songs and kings alike into a religious ritual. The business of making new laudations passed into the hands of a lower class. The singer became a hired servant: or rather, hired minstrels took the place of the old singers. The bard was a lowly member of the warrior-caste or of a mixed caste.† But is it from such that the Epic has come? This comes from the priest. The latter had stored together a mass of legendary narrative; he had ceased to celebrate new victories in new verse, but he had a fund of family-histories of heroic or godly character. The Epic arose from the priest's converting the minstrel-lays into poems, and connecting them with his store of tales that had existed as prose narration. The poem for recitation united the prose and lyric on a middle ground. The prose was beautified, the lay was robbed of its beauty. Narrative verse linked the two factors together at the same time, and in their subsequent expansion and later additions of wholly extraneous character we have the Mahābhārata.

What says the Epic of music? Apart from war, we find that the poem teems with musical allusions. It is worth while to study these. Lyre, flute, harp, cymbals, bells, drums, trumpets, and horns are accompaniments of every peaceful scene. Dance and song go hand in hand with recitation and narration as means of amusement. Different classes of musicians, *māgadhas*, *sūtas*, eulogists, professional players and praisers, both men and women, diversify the life of the court. The chief occupation of many of these players is to make instrumental music, especially on some state-occasion, a victory or wedding. But they also sing songs to amuse the royal family, and with soft music the members of the kingly court are always awakened. We see the wearied maiden 'sinking to sleep but clinging to her lyre,' and the Epic poet finds nothing fitter with which to describe wretchedness than that those once 'always awakened by music' should be now without it.*

---

* On this point the popular view is expressed by R. i. 79. 20: the Vedas, *dharma*, *nīti*, *dhanurveda*, riding, driving, elephant-riding, and *gandharvavidyāḥ* (music, etc.), are to be studied (compare R. i. 80. 4. the same *gandharvavidyā* with polity, writing, and arithmetic, *lekhyasaṁkhyāvid*: cf. R. ii. 2. 6). So in ix. 44. 22, after Veda, science of arms, etc., we find *vāṇī ca kevalā*, as a knight's knowledge.

† Compare Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 581.

The professional singers, and also the professional 'tellers of tales,' appear furthermore where we have been led to expect them, namely at great festivals or in religious ceremonies.† Thus, at a wedding conducted 'according to rule,' we have the noisy shell and horn, and then 'those whose business it was to sing songs, and the tellers of tales;' with dancers also, eulogizers, and minstrels.‡ A sort of dirge seems to be sung over the fallen heroes in the great 'scene of lamentation:' that is to say, in the songs of lamentation there seems to be involved the custom of singing a formal dirge, or song of death and glory in honor of the fallen, and apart from the later burial rites.[*]

---

* Lament over those 'formerly awakened by music,' iii. 236. 10; iv. 18. 19; R. vi. 37. 58. Compare *upagīyamānā nārībhiḥ*, ii. 58. 36, 37; iii. 44. 8–10, *gītaṁ nṛtyaṁ vāditraṁ vividham;* iv. 2. 28 (compare R. v. 22. 10, the same, but *vādyam*); R. ii. 67. 3; 62. 14; v. 13. 53: compare with the last, where drums and other instruments are also found, the words of R. ii. 96. 8–9; here the *sūta* and *māgadha* also appear in the capacity of awakeners, and the sleepers are further roused 'by songs appropriate' (*gāthābhir anurūpābhiḥ;* the *anurūpa* as noun early meant an antistrophic response in singing).

† A not insignificant change occurs in the scene of the imperial consecration. Here for the talks and songs we have the clumsy statement that at a great warrior-feast the guests devoted themselves to the theological and logical controversies of the learned priests, an imitation of the theological discussions more appropriate to a time of sacrifice, as in B. Ār. Up. iii. 1 ff. How different from the atmosphere of the simpler tradition, preserved e. g. in i. 192. 11; 193. 11 ff., where the great warriors 'talked such talk as no priest or man of the people could utter; for all night they lay and told tales of the army, and spoke of arms divine, of chariots and elephants and swords and clubs and battle-axes' (compare iii. 298. 7, below; and *yudhakathāḥ* in xiv. 15. 6, followed by the late *anugītā*). Compare again the late xv. 20. 4, *dharmyāḥ kathāç cakruḥ*, and ib. 27. 2.

‡ iv. 72. 26 ff. (29). Compare R. vi. 111. 3. That dancing and singing was in the later times regarded especially as woman's work, but also properly learned by twice-born men, is clear from the fact that such 'knowledge possessed by women and slaves' is regarded as a supplement of the Atharva-Veda, and the 'completion' of all study: that is to say, the twice-born man or Aryan should study the Vedas, and then first learn this art. Compare M. ii. 168; Vās. iii. 2; Āp. ii. 11. 29. 11–12. But legally priests that become dancers and singers lose caste (B. ii. 1. 2. 18).

For sacrifices as important as a horse-sacrifice, the divinities kindly provide the music; Tumburu and other celestials 'expert in song' (as well as in dancing) officiate as chief musicians at the most celebrated of these ceremonies (xiv. 88. 39), and seem to be a survival of the musical exhibition as wont to be performed by men. Nārada remains to the late pseudo-Epic the patron saint of music (*gāndharva*), as Bhārgava of polity (*nītiçāstra*), or Bharadvāja of the bow (*dhanurgraha*).[†] Again, victory-songs and genealogical recitations are given at a wedding (i. 184. 16), where, as above, a distinction is made between the eulogizers and callers of good-luck, and the tale-tellers and reciters of genealogies, such a distinction being inferable from the difference in title, and confirmed by the commentator;[‡] and it is probable that part of an entertainment consisted in giving a list of the forefathers of the person whose honor was celebrated, wherein allusions to the great deeds of each would also naturally find place.[§] At the great assembly, wrestlers and minstrels and bards amuse the court (ii. 4. 7). Another scene of quiet life reveals a banished king, old and blind, 'comforted by the storied fortunes of the kings of old' (iii. 298. 7, a legend). The fact that the singing was not a mere musical monotone or outcry is proved by the exchange of *gāthā*, verse, for *gīta*, song (sung): 'they sing verses.'[‖] The women singers have already been mentioned. They appear to belong properly to processional music, and sing to the sound of various instruments as the victor goes by, being accompanied by the *sūtas*, *māgadhas*, and *nāndīvādyas* (iv. 68. 28); or they precede the king with music of all sorts (iv. 34. 17). In the last case, it is expressly mentioned that some of the women were respectable and some were bawds (*kumāryaḥ* and *gaṇikāḥ*). A scene in the first book gives us a hint of the position of the 'praiser' in the king's house. The legend here makes a priest, although as instructor, the singer in the hall of an Asura king. The daughter of the king and the daughter of the priest go in bathing together, and, coming out, the priest's daughter finds that her clothes have been put on by the king's daughter, and says angrily: 'Why dost thou, being my pupil, take my clothes?' and the king's daughter as angrily responds: 'Thy father, as a praiser, stands below and constantly humbly praises my father when he is sitting or lying down; for thou art the daughter of one that asketh, praiseth, receiveth; I am the daughter of one that is praised, one that giveth, one that receiveth not' (i. 78. 9–10). The contemptuous comparison with the *bandin* or eulogizer places that singer in a very humble position. The story is not without value as indicating the Brahmanic singer's position as well: though, of course, it goes on to show how the king's daughter was made to feel that a priest is nobler than a king, and finally reduces the king's daughter to the position of maid to her former dependant.

---

[*] Compare xi. 17 ff. See also the whole account in R. vi. 94 ff. Here we have first a universal lament (12), of which the words are given, so that there was a universal song (28); followed by the individual song of sorrow, section 95.

[†] xii. 210. 19–21; though there are many *nyāyatantrāṇi*.

[‡] He defines *vāitālika* as a good-luck caller; *sūta*, as a teller of tales; *māgadha*, as a reciter of genealogies.

[§] Compare the genealogical tables given in the opening of the Mahābhārata itself (compare Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 594). With the tale-tellers compare i. 51. 15, *ity abravīt sūtradhāraḥ sūtaḥ pāurāṇikas tadā*; and also i. 214. 2.

[‖] iii. 43. 27, *gāthā gāyanti samnā*, i. e. *prītyā*. *Gāthā* is not sacred, as it was not in the songs of the martial improvisors; there as here, where the commentator distinguishes *gāthā*, as a secular, from *sāman* a religious song, the verses were worldly in tone.

Priests join the regular eulogists in praising the king (xii. 38. 12), as do all the people (iii. 257. 1): such praises being of course cries of congratulation, not songs with music, and being also common on the battlefield. Thus, as the troops draw out at dawn, the king is praised 'with wishes for victory': though even here we also find to the same end the singing of 'triumphant war-verses';[*] but as a general thing the battlefield praises are confined to 'hopes of good luck and wishes for a good day' (*jayāçis, puṇyāha*) chanted by heralds and Māgadhas.[†]

The musical instruments employed were chiefly, as said above, lyres, flutes, and cymbals, though more warlike music often accompanies quiet revelry.[‡] The lute, *vallakī*, seems to belong to the middle period of Epic development (vii. 6665 = 154. 25, v. l. in B, and pseudo-Epic); but the lyre, *vīṇā*, one of the oldest instruments, and the one we have seen mentioned as suitable for military music, is very common, and we are fortunate enough to have it pretty well described in the Epic itself. It is said in general that in a song the flute and lyre follow[§] the sound of the conch and cymbal. The lyre is spoken of (iv. 17. 14) as 'the sweet-voiced lyre, sending forth its strong notes,' and is more particularly described as having seven cords, *saptatantrī* (ἑπτάτονος φόρμιγξ: iii. 134. 14). The seven musical scales are described as a branch of study (*vāṇī saptavidhā*, ii. 11. 34); and we have the bass described as the chord giving the 'big sound,' *mahāsvana*. We are told further that the string (*tantrī*) of the lyre rests on two supports (*upadhānā*), just like the cord tied at each extremity to the bow-end.*

---

[*] *jāitrāiḥ sāṁgrāmikāir manṭrāiḥ*, vii. 84. 15.

[†] ib. 21; so *āçīrvādāiḥ pariṣvaktaḥ* (vii. 112. 62), etc.

[‡] Compare xii. 53. 5, where *vīṇā, paṇava, veṇu*, and other war-instruments play together; with singers and *pāṇisvanikas*.

[§] *anunādin*, v. 90. 11–16.

We may believe, since the lyre of later times seems to be the same as the older 'seven-stringed lyre,' that this was the instrument which first accompanied lyric strains in India, going back perhaps to a period older than that when Terpander increased the four strings of the Greek lyre to seven (unless in the latter case Bergk's hypothesis of verse-divisions destroy the parallel).

The common reed-flute, known as *veṇu*, and found everywhere in the Epic beside the lyre, is not known to the Rig-Veda by that name; but other reed instruments (*nāla*, *nāḍī*, etc.) are common from the earliest time, and we may imagine that the flute under one of these names was also one of the most primitive instruments in the music of antiquity.†

---

* iv. 35. 16: in reality the comparison is inverted. On *tantrī* compare the proverb in R. ii. 38. 24, *nā 'tantrī vādyate vīṇā*. I believe this description coincides with those of later works. See Wilson on the *vīṇā*, Mṛcch., Act iii., note, where he says the flute has seven holes; the lyre, seven strings. My own ignorance of music prevents my understanding very well the technical jargon found in the Purāṇas, but the general distribution of sounds seems coincident with that of the later period. The Epic makes no class of the five special instruments of later times, *bherī*, *mṛdaṅga*, *çaṅkha*, *paṇava*, *ḍiṇḍima*. To the explanation in P.W. under *mūrchanā* as a musical term add Vāyu P. ii. 24 and 25, where a full account is given, and compare ib. 24. 36.

† The tellers of genealogies need by no means have been mere dry reciters of family-records. They probably made their accounts interesting by a judicious mixture of pure legend. In later times we find fairy stories quoted from these *vaṅçavids*, as e. g. a pleasing story of Bhāgīrathī to explain the name is referred to the *vaṅçavittamāḥ*. Compare Vāyu P. ii. 26. 62 (*vaṅçavido janāḥ*) to ib. 170 (*evaṁ vaṅçapurāṇajñā gāyanti*). I have already noted, above, p. 69, that the heroes as described are chiefly amused by tales and the singing of low-caste musicians. Such performers are generally spoken of with disapprobation as a moral evil, and the names *kuçīlava* and *çāilūṣa* show the same feeling for actors generally. Although a kind of drama (as said above, p. 121) seems implied (especially in iii. 15. 14; xii. 69. 60, etc., and in *raṅgāvataraṇa* xii. 295. 5, or *raṅgavāṭa*; iii. 20. 27), we have no need of understanding more than pantomime in any of these allusions; and, for my part, I cannot see any recognition of real drama in the Epic. The uncomplimentary terms for dancers are common enough, especially in the pseudo-Epic (xii. 314. 28, they are of the quality of darkness; xiii. 17. 50, *nṛtyapriyo nityanarto nartakaḥ sarvalālasaḥ*); and the paraphernalia of the stage could scarcely have escaped notice, had the pure drama been contemporaneous with even the pseudo-Epic. I see in the different regard paid to the public amusers a development something parallel to that shown above in dicing: at first, not dishonored; later, the amusement indulged in but regarded with contempt; later still, the amusement common, and the amusers despised; finally, dancing (and finally acting) become a patronized sport of the court. From the Epic connection of the stage with dancing and singing, the drama must have been developed by combining the art of singers with that of story-tellers, and perhaps *vaṅçavids*, and been wholly secular. The gradual restriction of this amusement is shown in Āp. ii. 10. 25. 14.

## V. APPENDIX ON THE STATUS OF WOMAN.

Woman is to the Hindu a creature of secondary importance. As the goddesses among the gods, stand the heroines among the heroes of the Epic. But conventional sayings, of which there is a vast number, and the facts that may be inferred, give us together a fair idea of the position of woman in the middle ages of India, and even enable us to see how that position has changed, or was in process of changing, during the growth of the Epic itself.

Except in legal literature, there is little prior to the Epic that can furnish a satisfactory view of woman's life. What we know from Rig-Vedic literature may be summed up in few words. The girls were allowed their freedom, like the boys. Very early marriages appear to be unknown. At a ripe age the girl was married, and became the one wife of one husband, whom she herself had chosen, giving up her parents' home to enter absolutely into the family of her lord. With that husband as companion as well as lord she shared an equal footing in religious rights, and was not excluded from participation in social enjoyment. She had a separate but not an exclusive apartment. At her husband's death she retired to live with her son or returned to the home of her parents. Only as queen was she obliged to suffer rivals, and then probably as a political necessity. From rather unsatisfactory evidence, we may conclude that female children were liable, however, to be exposed; and that near blood marriages were not interdicted.

The early law-period is best considered in reference to the Epic custom and law. Much was changed in woman's life ere the conditions under which the Epic presents her were reached. The woman of the Mahābhārata in its completed form is best described in short by negativing most of the description taken from the earliest Vedic age. The position held by her in the time to which we must refer the beginnings of the Epic lies somewhat between these two.

But in talking of woman we are, so to speak, confounding, from the later point of view, three different beings. The inherent complexity of woman's nature is aggravated in India by the social accident of her relation to men; and we find here, for all social considerations, as great a difference between woman and woman caused by marriage as between man and man caused by caste. This difference is heightened by the fact that women also (though, as I think, in less degree than men) were separated by the caste-regulations. But inside the pale of one caste we have always to distinguish sharply between woman, wife, and widow. The first had no value. The second was of exaggerated importance. Again, the widow was a being socially apart from both girl and wife. It is only under these rubrics that we can study the condition of woman at all. For woman in general is but chattel, and receives only the respect due from a sensible man to potentially valuable property.

We have indeed a number of pretty sentiments in regard to woman, especially in regard to her purity, that seem to place her in another light; and when we read that 'a woman's mouth is always pure,' or that 'three things do not become impure, women, gems, and water' (xii. 165. 32; M. v. 130), we are tempted to believe that an ideal position of women has been thus early reached. No greater mistake is possible. The only ideal of the early Hindu in this regard was of practical convenience and sensual gratification. The proverbs quoted above are dry ceremonial statutes; most things render a man at certain times impure, as the sight of a dog, a tear, etc.; but, for the sake of convenience, the rule requiring him to rinse the mouth or bathe on thus becoming impure is done away with in the cases cited; and the whole force of the pretty saying is destroyed when we consider that the author is far from meaning women in general in this verse. He means only women of good caste. A woman of degraded caste was *ipso facto* impure, and to taste of her mouth was to render one's self liable to the severest penance.*

We may still consider woman as far as possible apart from her social conditions if we examine the descriptions given by the poet, which, though applied to one specimen, are serviceable as portraying the mental and bodily ideal women—descriptions which do not vary much in law and in Epic. It is thus that the beautiful Krishnā† is described by her husband, after he has gambled her away as a stake in the madness of his dice-playing: 'Not too short is she, and not too tall; black-eyed is she, and fragrant; her eyes are like the lotus, and her breath like autumn's wind; welcome as autumn after the summer rain, and loved as autumn is beloved; slender is her waist, broad are her hips; blue-black her hair, and well-arranged' (i. 67. 158, Draupadī). She is described again, and more fully, in another passage; and adding this to a description of another woman in a later book, we get for the bodily ideal a result that tallies well with the technical enumeration of beauties furnished by still a fourth passage, and is corroborated by the legal works that warn against certain faults in women's personal appearance.* Blue-black hair seems to have been the favorite color. Red hair must have been well known, since the sages regard it as objectionable to marry a girl 'with auburn hair,' which is a characteristic, it is said, of Western girls. Girls so afflicted dyed their hair in later times. The Epic women are dark, and their hair is blue-black, parted in the middle, and the part marked, perhaps, with a pigment.† The eyes should be large and black; the lips, red; the teeth, white; the bosom and navel, deep; the breasts and hips, high. Further particulars, not specially edifying or translatable, but not differing from the Epic ideal, are found in the Bṛhat-Saṁhitā, and in the Purānas.‡

---

* xiii. 126. 25 (=M. iii. 155), *vṛṣalīpati;* by marriage, *yāuna*, xii. 165. 37. Compare Jolly on the legal position of women in India, *Sitz. d. K. Bayer. Akad.*, 1876, p. 423.

† Where the name does not necessarily indicate her color as black, since she may be merely the feminine to Krishna: the subject involving the original conception of the character. Fair women are attested by the Greek observer: see Ktesias i. 9 in Ind. Ant. x., with notes there.

Interesting is our next general problem: what character did the Hindus assign to their women? Separate here tale and proverb. For no more tender and delicate types of women are to be found than Sāvitrī and Sītā (I have not so high an opinion of the much-vaunted Damayantī), and to have portrayed such characters is a vindication of the possibility of their historic existence. But on the other hand we have misogynistic sayings enough to show a popular disdain of woman. Only one circumstance is worthy of note: viz., that those who most indulge in these remarks have (in India) least cause to make them. 'A woman's nature is always unsteadfast'—this truth is uttered by the scapegrace Nala, who gambled away his kingdom, and ran away from the wife that remained steadfast to the end.§ Part of the wisdom imparted to another king that gambled away his wife is: 'woman is the root of all evil, for women are always light-minded;'‖ and the hardest blow is given to their virtue in the innuendo that even women of good family are envious of common prostitutes, wishing for the clothes and adornment that fall to the lot of the latter (xiii. 38.

---

* The second description of Draupadī is found in iv. 9. 1. Compare with this iv. 37. 1 ff., the technicalities in v. 116. 1 ff., and many incidental references, as viii. 73. 84, *pṛthuçroṇi* of Krishnā: compare also M. iii. 5 ff.

† i. 44. 3, *sīmanta:* compare N. Compare Wilson's Theatre, Vikram., p. 250, note.

‡ On the *strīlakṣaṇa* see Ag. P. 242 (*puruṣalakṣaṇa*, 243); the dramatic ideal corresponds: compare e. g. Vikram., beginning of Act iv.; the king's remarks on Çakuntalā, Act i., etc. In Epic add xiii. 104. 131 ff. (C. omits 132 b). The Bṛh. Saṁ. 70. 16 ff. gives some peculiar tests of women's correct form, and of their virtue, depending on the length of the toes, etc.; in 23 we find *prāyo virūpāsu bhavanti ḍoṣā yatrā 'kṛtis tatra guṇā vasanti* as a general rule. For minuter norms, see the whole chapter.

§ iii. 71. 6, *strīsvabhāvaç calo loke;* literally, varium et mutabile semper femina.

‖ xiii. 38. 1 ff.; repeated in 12, with 'no greater evil exists than woman. In vs. 17 we find M. ix. 14.

19). It is, perhaps, more philosophic reflection than misogynistic spite when the causal nexus of woe is traced back to woman: 'birth causes evil, woman causes birth, therefore women are answerable for woe' (xii. 213. 7). Love is a woman's whole desire. 'The mass of women hangs on love,' a wily adviser suggests to a king, 'and therefore, O king, if thou hast deprived thy subjects of their sons by thy wars, make the girls marry, and they will quit their sorrow' (xii. 33. 45). Woman's nature is to injure man: 'a man should not marry a woman of low caste, for the nature of woman is to injure man; be a man wise or foolish, women drag him down.'[*] When Father Manu went to heaven, he gave to men women—weak, easily seduced, loving and lying, jealous of love and honor, passionate and foolish—nevertheless respect (married) women.'[†] The unusual fondness for love characteristic of woman is set forth in another verse: 'women are blessed with love, and slaves with pity' (xiv. 90. 14). And woman's untrustworthiness is recorded again: 'let not the king take counsel with fools and women' (iii. 150. 44; xii. 83. 56), a verse often repeated, with the warning 'never shall that be accomplished which is confided as a secret to the mind of a woman.'[‡] The historical reason for woman's lack of secretiveness is given in the story of a very pious saint, who cursed all women, because his mother revealed a secret: 'therefore he cursed all women, saying "they shall never keep a secret"; so he cursed them, because he was grieved' (xii. 6. 11).

In what then consist the virtues of women in the Hindu ideal? 'The strength of a king is power; the strength of a priest is holiness; but beauty, wealth, and youth are the strength of a woman—the greatest of all' (xii. 321. 73). A sentiment found oftener is this, however, that 'the strength of woman is obedience.'[§]

Such passages as these might be multiplied; but it suffices to have learned what the Hindu opinion was on this point. There is, to be sure, an antecedent impossibility of newness connected with the inquiry which robs it of freshness. Yet it is not without interest that we study the doctrine of India in regard to woman's nature; for in no point could the country for so long have remained original and free from foreign influence of thought. Except for slave girls, their women were their own; the opinions are based on narrow generalizations, and on that account, to those familiar with the same generalizations abroad, the more curious. To the Hindu, woman is inferior because she is weak, because she does not argue dispassionately or clearly, and because she is a creature of emotions, especially of love. For the Hindu Epic warrior is not ashamed to weep; only he scorns, or rather ignores, the sentimentality of love. From two points of view, love is a weakness. The soldier looks upon it as does the boy of to-day; the philosopher looks upon it as the origin of evil, and one with that desire which forms the first link in a chain of unhappy succurrent existences. Love as a passion the Hindu felt, appreciated, and deplored. As a sentiment, it does not exist, till the later Romantic age begins, that age which gives us the tales of good women, and later the lyric poetry. Women, at first free and unguarded, become gradually mere inmates of the inner house; they are watched and kept in ignorance. Outside of the generally pure lives of these guarded respectable women lie the lives of those whose presence preponderates in camp and city life—the 'women of the crowd,' mentioned only by groups, the dancing girls, the courtezans, prostitutes, and other vulgarities, who from the records of law and Epic abounded in the early as well as the later times.*

---

[*] xiii. 48. 36 ff.; M. ii. 213–14, vv. ll.

[†] Ib. 46. 8 ff. The addition is necessary, as the context shows. In spite of all these faults, a wedded woman should be respected, because she is Manu's gift to man.

[‡] xi. 27. 30; not in C! cf. v. 38. 42.

[§] v. 34. 75. Parallel passages, xiii. 40. 8 ff.

In strict accordance with this view of women stand the sayings in regard to her treatment. 'Women (but wives are meant) should always be honored and petted. For when they are honored, the deities rejoice. . . and houses cursed by them

---

*Besides the laws regarding adultery (see below), allusions to prostitutes and loose characters are plentiful. We have seen that city and camp are full of them. The king is advised to avoid connection with (*svāiriṇīṣu, klībāsu*) 'unlawful women,' xii. 90. 29–39. So 'doubtful women' ought to be avoided, xii. 35. 30. The verse on the 'non-independence' of a king says he is not *svatantra*, may not do as he will, in respect of games, women, council, etc. (xii. 321. 139). The report of Strabo shows that the king was attended regularly by slave-women; but this could have been, in accordance with Hindu law, for only part of the day (see above, p. 174f). The 'loose women' that frequent the gambling halls are well known, ii. 68. 1. Among the rules for priests are many that show how vague, in spite of vows of chastity, must have been their morals and those of their neighbors in other castes. It is sinful to eat the food of one conquered by a woman, or of one who marries before his elder brother, or the food of a common prostitute (*gaṇikā*), or of men that suffer an *upapati*, or of a player (*raṅgastrījīvita*), xii. 36. 25 ff. In most of the disgusting tales in the Epic we find a great saint seducing some decent girl, and it is to be remarked that such connections are not condemned; that prostitution itself is not condemned as a profession; that wifely honor was esteemed, but maidenly honor not regarded except on practical grounds; that chastity in a man not particularly bound by an oath is looked upon as a matter of wonder. All the rules for chastity have purely practical reasons for their existence. Passion and love are the same thing, and are looked upon, like sneezing, as a natural impulse, best yielded to at once. Of purely moral censure of indulgence in passion there is no word.

are as if infected by magic' (xiii. 46. 5 ff.). To interpret the feeling that causes this, we may say that it is of the first importance that a wife should do as her husband wishes; if she is not petted and made much of, she will grow disagreeable; therefore the husband should keep her in good humor. This interpretation is inevitable, if we study the Hindu rules on the subject.[*]

The woman must be subservient to the man, but in intercourse with her he must obey her desires. In all these rules, and they are many, the woman, however, as woman is not regarded. It is always the practical effect of breaking them that is kept in view. So, too, with the laws that seem to evince a high moral standard: 'three sins lead to destruction—these are theft, adultery, and desertion of a friend.'[†] 'There are four chief vices—gambling, intoxication, women, and hunting—he that does not foolishly rejoice in these is freed (from error).'[‡]

What we may call rules of priestly conduct are so explicit as to suggest a predilection for the faults named: 'one should not (openly) eat or sleep with a woman;'[§] 'one should not have carnal intercourse with a woman by day, or (at any time) with a loose woman, or with a woman that has not just bathed.' (xiii. 104. 108). It is said that such intercourse is always allowable if practiced in secret, restricted only by seasons, for practical reasons.[‖]

To cast the 'evil eye,' *cakṣur duṣṭam*, on a woman who is another's wife renders one debased; debased, in the next life, are also those that look at naked women with evil thoughts; and those that offend sexually against nature, *viyonāu.* Especially strict, of course, are the rules for students, who were unaccount, to those familiar with the same generalizations abroad, the more curious. To the Hindu, woman is inferior because she is weak, because she does not argue dispassionately or clearly, and because she is a creature of emotions, especially of love. For the Hindu Epic warrior is not ashamed to weep; only he scorns, or rather ignores, the sentimentality of love. From two points of view, love is a weakness. The soldier looks upon it as does the boy of to-day; the philosopher looks upon it as the origin of evil, and one with that desire which forms the first link in a chain of unhappy succurrent existences. Love as a passion the Hindu felt, appreciated, and deplored. As a sentiment, it does not exist, till the later Romantic age begins, that age which gives us the tales of good women, and later the lyric poetry. Women, at first free and unguarded, become gradually mere inmates of the inner house; they are watched and kept in ignorance. Outside of the generally pure lives of these guarded respectable women lie the lives of those whose presence preponderates in camp and city life—the 'women of the crowd,' mentioned only by groups, the dancing girls, the courtezans, prostitutes, and other vulgarities, who from the records of law and Epic abounded in the early as well as the later times.*

---

[*] See particularly Manu iii. 55 ff., ix. 1 ff. The pretty sentiment in the mouth of the Lord speaking to Soma—'Never despise a woman or a priest'—is a fair instance of the danger of rendering too generally, or into our modes of expression. Soma had neglected Dakṣa's daughters, and is commanded to unite with them, at their desire, ix. 35. 82.

[†] v. 33. 65. *Paradārābhimarçin* occurs in xiii. 23. 61.

[‡] xii. 289. 26; 59. 60; iii. 13. 7. Compare above, p. 61 ff.

[§] xii. 193. 24. This may be done in secret, xiii. 163. 47.

[‖] xii. 193. 17 (comm. and ib. 9, *ṛtukāle*). On this head, ib. 228. 44–45; 243. 6 ff. If a man receives an injunction (*nirdeça*) from a woman, he should gratify her desire, even if it be the wife of the teacher, ib. 267. 41; 34. 27: cf. xiii. 49. 12 ff. Those that cohabit *rajasvalāsu nārīṣu* incur *brahmavadhyā* personified, xii. 283. 46. The converse in xiii. 90. 28; 104. 150; 163. 41. Sex-differentiation depends on the time, ib. 104. 151; females are born from the fifth, males from the sixth day. But in xiii. 87. 10, the girl from second, the boy from third day. Compare on *māithuna*, xiii. 125. 24; 129. 1. Speculation on this point was common, as in Greece; so Hesiod says sex is determined by the day of procreation. Compare Bṛh. Saṁ. 78. 23–4. As well known, the law of Manu makes sex-differentiation depend on the respective vigor of the parents (M. iii. 49).

In strict accordance with this view of women stand the sayings in regard to her treatment. 'Women (but wives are meant) should always be honored and petted. For when they are honored, the deities rejoice. . . and houses cursed by them are as if infected by magic' (xiii. 46. 5 ff.). To interpret the feeling that causes this, we may say that it is of the first importance that a wife should do as her husband wishes; if she is not petted and made much of, she will grow disagreeable; therefore the husband should keep her in good humor. This interpretation is inevitable, if we study the Hindu rules on the subject.[*]

---

* Besides the laws regarding adultery (see below), allusions to prostitutes and loose characters are plentiful. We have seen that city and camp are full of them. The king is advised to avoid connection with (*svāiriṇīṣu, klībāsu*) 'unlawful women,' xii. 90. 29–39. So 'doubtful women' ought to be avoided, xii. 35. 30. The verse on the 'non-independence' of a king says he is not *svatantra*, may not do as he will, in respect of games, women, council, etc. (xii. 321. 139). The report of Strabo shows that the king was attended regularly by slave-women; but this could have been, in accordance with Hindu law, for only part of the day (see above, p. 174). The 'loose women' that frequent the gambling halls are well known, ii. 68. 1. Among the rules for priests are many that show how vague, in spite of vows of chastity, must have been their morals and those of their neighbors in other castes. It is sinful to eat the food of one conquered by a woman, or of one who marries before his elder brother, or the food of a common prostitute (*gaṇikā*), or of men that suffer an *upapati*, or of a player (*raṅgastrījīvita*), xii. 36. 25 ff. In most of the disgusting tales in the Epic we find a great saint seducing some decent girl, and it is to be remarked that such connections are not condemned; that prostitution itself is not condemned as a profession; that wifely honor was esteemed, but maidenly honor not regarded except on practical grounds; that chastity in a man not particularly bound by an oath is looked upon as a matter of wonder. All the rules for chastity have purely practical reasons for their existence. Passion and love are the same thing, and are looked upon, like sneezing, as a natural impulse, best yielded to at once. Of purely moral censure of indulgence in passion there is no word.

The woman must be subservient to the man, but in intercourse with her he must obey her desires. In all these rules, and they are many, the woman, however, as woman is not regarded. It is always the practical effect of breaking them that is kept in view. So, too, with the laws that seem to evince a high moral standard: 'three sins lead to destruction—these are theft, adultery, and desertion of a friend.'[†] 'There are four chief vices—gambling, intoxication, women, and hunting—he that does not foolishly rejoice in these is freed (from error).'[‡]

What we may call rules of priestly conduct are so explicit as to suggest a predilection for the faults named: 'one should not (openly) eat or sleep with a woman;'[§] 'one should not have carnal intercourse with a woman by day, or (at any time) with a loose woman, or with a woman that has not just bathed.' (xiii. 104. 108). It is said that such intercourse is always allowable if practiced in secret, restricted only by seasons, for practical reasons.[‖]

To cast the 'evil eye,' *cakṣur duṣṭam*, on a woman who is another's wife renders one debased; debased, in the next life, are also those that look at naked women with evil thoughts; and those that offend sexually against nature, *viyonāu*. Especially strict, of course, are the rules for students, who were under vows of chastity till their study was ended. Such a student may not even talk to women outside of the family.*

---

[*] See particularly Manu iii. 55 ff., ix. 1 ff. The pretty sentiment in the mouth of the Lord speaking to Soma—'Never despise a woman or a priest'—is a fair instance of the danger of rendering too generally, or into our modes of expression. Soma had neglected Dakṣa's daughters, and is commanded to unite with them, at their desire, ix. 35. 82.

[†] v. 33. 65. *Paradārābhimarçin* occurs in xiii. 23. 61.

[‡] xii. 289. 26; 59. 60; iii. 13. 7. Compare above, p. 61 ff.

[§] xii. 193. 24. This may be done in secret, xiii. 163. 47.

[‖] xii. 193. 17 (comm. and ib. 9, *ṛtukāle*). On this head, ib. 228. 44–45; 243. 6 ff. If a man receives an injunction (*nirdeça*) from a woman, he should gratify her desire, even if it be the wife of the teacher, ib. 267. 41; 34. 27: cf. xiii. 49. 12 ff. Those that cohabit *rajasvalāsu nārīṣu* incur *brahmavadhyā* personified, xii. 283. 46. The converse in xiii. 90. 28; 104. 150; 163. 41. Sex-differentiation depends on the time, ib. 104. 151; females are born from the fifth, males from the sixth day. But in xiii. 87. 10, the girl from second, the boy from third day. Compare on *māithuna*, xiii. 125. 24; 129. 1. Speculation on this point was common, as in Greece; so Hesiod says sex is determined by the day of procreation. Compare Bṛh. Saṁ. 78. 23–4. As well known, the law of Manu makes sex-differentiation depend on the respective vigor of the parents (M. iii. 49).

Let us follow out the treatment of women in another direction. It was mentioned above that in the Vedic age there is some evidence to show that female children were occasionally exposed. This had passed by. In the early Epic period, woman lived on probation. She was allowed to live until her father or her husband saw fit to slay her. From all other men, she was, so far as her life went, secure. 'This verse has been sung of old by Vālmīki, women should not be slain' (vii. 143. 67). This rule is, of course, not a legal one. Women were tortured to death by law, for instance, if they were faithless. But it is a rule of chivalry, forbidding the strong to kill the weaker. It is one with the advanced code of military rules discussed above, and is universally found.† This rule implies legally so much, however, that the infliction of capital punishment in regular form, *vadha*—that is, by decapitation or smiting on the head—is not in a woman's case to be performed for the many offenses rendering men liable thereto.‡ But the legal penalty for killing a woman is not in any case very heavy, and if she chance to be of low caste, it is very little. If a man kill a married woman (other than the teacher's wife —the teacher and all that belongs to him are all-sacred), he should undergo penance for two years; in the case of the teacher's wife, for three years.§

There is perhaps an indication of national Aryan superiority of civilization in the legend that 'Kāyavya laid down a law for the barbarians: he said "thou shouldst not kill a frightened woman; no warrior should ever kill a woman."'‖

---

* xiii. 104. 116; 145. 50. The prohibition against looking at a naked woman (here and in xii. 214. 12; xiii. 163. 47) is extended in xiii. 104. 47 and 53 to a rule forbidding one to speak to an unknown woman, especially one in her courses. *udakyā*. Mutual desire, as a rule, excuses intercourse (see the marriage rules, below), but he that has forcible connection with a girl 'passes into darkness,' xiii. 45. 22. The student's rule is given in xii. 214. 12 ff.

† Killing a woman is reckoned as sinful as killing a priest or a cow, xiii. 126. 28: i. e. it was a high crime. Moreover, such a deed results in the murderer's being reborn in some despised shape, ib. 111. 112 ff. The use of a king, it is said, is this, that if a man who kills a woman should get applause in the assembly, the king will frighten him (and put him down), xii. 73. 16.

‡ We have to distinguish the military *na hantavyāḥ* rule, quoted above, and the technical *avadhyāḥ*, i. 217. 4. The latter case is plainly stated in i. 158. 31: 'in the verdict of law the law-knowers say that a woman is not to be exposed to *vadha*.' Compare also ii. 41. 13, *strīṣu na çastram pātayet*. On the other hand, compare the horrible death-penalty of an adulteress (see below).

§ xii. 165. 60 (*paradāre*). There is an Epic roughness about this rule. The law-books distinguish with great care between murder and manslaughter.

‖ xii. 135. 13; *dasyu*=*mleccha*.

Among the sins looked upon as 'without expiation' (as a variation on the saying quoted above) we find injury to a friend, thanklessness, woman-killing, and teacher-killing. It is quite in accord with the character of the Epic that we find one verse giving the expiation for a crime, and another denying the existence of such expiation (xii. 108. 32). To steal women is also one of the customs reprehended by Aryan law,* and we find it especially laid down for the *dasyu* that he should avoid union with (Aryan) women of high station, and theft of women.† Nevertheless, the Aryans, as they always carried captured women into slavery, could not have been free from this fashion.‡ Indeed, one of the marriage-forms is simply robbery of the girl, and one of the uses of a king is, it is said, to prevent women being stolen (xii. 67. 8 ff.)—that is, to put a stop to this antiquated form of marriage, of which, however, the Epic affords traditional examples in the case of its chief heroes.

How closely the legal part of the Epic hangs together in all formal statement of the rules of propriety we may see by comparing with the above the regulations of the *dharmasūtras*, not to speak of the *çāstra* of Manu, with which the later Epic stands on an equal footing in many points. Thus, the *dharmasūtras* are precise in ordering that no breach of chastity shall be risked by contact with, or looking upon a woman.§ The especial sanctity of the teacher's wife is evinced by the rule that the student shall not mention her name, and shall serve her as well as the teacher (G. ii. 18, 31; Āp. i. 2. 7. 30). Special rules for greeting women are given, and some give even a rule here for colloquial intercourse between husband and wife (G. vi. 6 ff.) The supposed immaculate character of woman is not maintained, but some curious regulations are to be found. Thus, it is said by Vasishtha that only three acts make women impure: becoming an outcast, murdering her husband, and slaying her unborn child;‖ but according to Gautama, abortion and connection with a low-caste make a woman an outcast (Vās. xxviii. 7; G. xxi. 9). Notwithstanding that it is said by Vasishtha that a woman is pure in all her limbs, and is not defiled by her lover (Vās. xxviii. 9, 1–6.), we read in the same work that to make herself pure the woman has to sip water (Vās. iii. 31–34; B. i. 5. 8. 22). Woman was, therefore, in general less exposed than man to accidental theoretical impurities, but crimes of the gravest nature made her impure; and, though not impure for herself from natural causes, she might render the man who associated with her impure. The giving of right of way to a woman seems also to rest on this footing in the law-treatises; for, though given in the form common to the Epic and to Manu in three of the *dharmasūtras*, that of Baudhāyana restricts the gallantry to the case of a pregnant woman.* As to killing a woman, we find in all the law-books that the punishment is in proportion not only to the caste, but to the condition of the woman at the time of her murder.† For an ordinary woman—that is, for women in general—a modified penance is ordained by law, while for the accidental slaughter of an unchaste woman or harlot there is no penance at all, or at the most 'a bag.'‡

---

* 'One must not sell human beings,' G. vii. 14; 'females are not lost by possession,' G. xii. 39; Vās. xvi. 18; M. viii. 149.

† *Dasyu* here is slave, xii. 133. 16–17.

‡ There is a passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (interpolated perhaps) referring to slave girls presented as gifts: Ait. Br. viii. 22.

§ G. ii. 16; Āp. i. 2. 7. 3, 8–10. In respect of *māithuna*, no intercourse is allowed *ṛtukāle*, but the penalty is slight: G. xxiii. 34; M. xi. 174. Of course no attention is paid to this rule in Epic legends. One should not eat what is touched by a woman in her courses; and anything handled by women seems impure: G. xvii. 10; Āp. i. 5. 16. 28; Vās. iii. 45.

‖ On modes of abortion, compare i. 177. 46; *açmanā kukṣiṁ nirbibheda*, of the abortioness. Compare the same act in V. P. iv. 4.

But few general rules remain to be considered for women. Legally, they could be witnesses only for women (M. viii. 68; Vās. xvi. 30). Religiously, they had no independent part in Veda-study or in sacrifice, merely helping their husbands in the manual part of the daily service, and (barring accidental representation) being entitled, like the slaves, to merely a perfunctory acquiescent word during religious rites, their knowledge being classed with that of slaves as the last thing that a man should study, and consisting of improper tales, singing, dancing, and mechanical arts.

The Epic rule agrees with the legal of course in generally excluding women from sacrifice, feasts to the Manes, and fasting,§ and confining their religion to 'obedience to the husband'; but we find terrible religious austerities undergone by the maid of Kāçī, performed, like those of an ordinary ascetic, with a view of compassing earthly power by religious merit (v. 186. 19).

Finally, as we cannot suppose for a moment that the Epic represents either chronological or geographical unity, we must always understand that 'the women of India' means the Aryan women approved of by the late redaction, when rules for conduct are given; since we read of women whose customs are directly opposed to those allowed by the Epic ideal, women who dance naked, and get drunk, and behave with open and unabashed immodesty;* and though we know that the practice of 'guarding' or shutting women up was of comparatively recent origin, yet we have to assume this as the custom for all respectable women of the 'Epic age,' the only exceptions being those of older traditional tales, girls in lowly circumstances, and country girls. City women of respectable character were neither seen nor heard. Yet the feasts and rejoicings of a still later epoch† show us women freely commingling with men, and we must suppose that absolute secretion of women was practiced only in the families of kings or of the highest nobles, and that the occasional return to a natural life was a temporary adoption of rules current in lower society.‡ Some women seem recognized as not restricted by the ordinary rules of seclusion.§

---

* G. vi. 24; Āp. ii. 5. 11. 7; Vās. xiii. 58; B. ii. 3. 6. 30; Mbh. xiii. 163. 38.

† Penance for the slaughter of a Brahman woman in her courses stands always first. Compare G. xxii. 12; Āp. i. 9. 24. 9; Vās. xx. 34 sq.; B. i. 10. 19. 3; ii. 1. 1. 11: M. xi. 88.

‡ G. xxii. 17, 26–27; Āp. i. 9. 24. 5.

§ iii. 205. 22; women have no *yajñakriyāḥ*, no *çrāddha*, and no *upavāsakam*, but their means of heaven is *bhartari çuçrūṣā*.

It is now time to draw that necessary distinction in treating of Hindu women to which allusion was made at the outset, and review the three periods of woman's life, as girl, wife, and widow.

The Girl.‖—Krishnā, the daughter of Drupada, was, considering her beauty and her marital complications, an exceedingly well instructed woman, and was able to argue very cleverly with her sage lord, Yudhishthira. Much of this wisdom she gleaned from him rather late in life, but other sources of knowledge were open to her from an early period. To one of these she refers at the close of a grand discussion on the difficult question of fate, involving subtile questions of human and divine power, with which she is remarkably familiar: 'this I learned (in childhood) as a sage priest taught it to my brother, while I sat in my father's lap and listened.'¶ The picture drawn here represents an unusual home scene; for notices of the life of girls except in an epigrammatic or didactic way are rare.

---

* The Madrakāḥ, women of Çalya's country: compare viii. 40. 17 ff. Compare the Bāhīkas in ib. 44. 1 ff.; 45. 19 ff.; v. 39. 80, 'Bālhīkas are the refuse of earth.' In B. (the same proverb) Bālhīka and Vāhīka. (sic).

† Not alone in the Harivaṅça. In i. 222. 21, the women get drunk at a picnic. Compare above, p. 121.

‡ To see the city sights, processions, etc., the women sit on the roofs, away from the public (i. 69. 1 ff.).

§ ii. 31. 38; women in Mahiṣmatī by especial permission of Agni are 'not guarded' by their husbands and are dissolute (*svāiriṇyaḥ . . yatheṣṭhaṁ vicaranti*). The expression *rakṣ*, usually used of keeping women secluded, may be used in an entirely unconventional sense, as *yoṣit sadā rakṣyā*, i. 111. 12, means that one ought never to injure a woman. For fuller treatment, see below.

‖ Parāç. vii. 4 defines a ripe girl, *kanyā*, as a maid of ten years; one of nine is called *rohiṇī*; one of eight, *gāurī*.

¶ iii. 32. 60–62, the *bṛhaspatiproktā nītiḥ* is meant, on *dāiva*, *pāuruṣa*, and *haṭha* (ib. 32).

But Drupada was a king, and must have been an unusually affectionate father, for in general there appears to have been no sentiment but contempt for the girl. At least, this is the frequent statement: boys are blessings, girls are a nuisance. Girls, anyway, are no good, 'but a daughter is a torment,' it is said.* The care of marrying her and the responsibility she unworthily bears is meant; as Mātali exclaims in another place, against the girls of great families, that a daughter is a constant risk to three families, her mother's family, her father's, and finally her husband's (v. 97. 15–16). But natural affection was stronger than systematic contempt, and we are glad to learn from the Epic's own words that, in spite of the usual fixed difference in the regard felt for son and daughter, 'some fathers love the boy more; some, the girl' (i. 157. 37). A rule of the 'house-manuals' says that when a man returns from a journey and meets his son he should kiss him on the head, and murmur 'out of the heart art thou born; thou art the self called son; O live a hundred years,' and kiss him three times more, murmuring benedictions—'but his daughter he should only kiss, without words.'

But almost all the occasions on which girls are mentioned have to do with their marriage. For the universal rule of Epic and formal law compelled the girl to marry when she was yet immature. Before the time of marriage she appears as a naked child, or, if somewhat older, either as a child-princess whose main interest just before her marriage is to get new clothes for her doll, or as a clever little damsel picking up wisdom on her father's lap.†

According to law and Epic usage, and even to a suggestive verse in the Rig-Veda, it would seem that the brother was scarcely less necessary to the girl's fortune than the father. The brother preserved the sister from a rude fate, since Aryan rule prohibits marriage with a girl that has no brother. Of such a girl the Rig-Veda speaks as if it were a matter of course that she should not be married, but should become a common woman of the streets.

---

* i. 159. 11–12, *kṛcchraṁ tu duhitā*, etc.

† The princess Uttarā asks Arjuna, to whose son she is shortly married (after he himself had declined her hand when offered by her father), to bring back cloth with which to dress the dolls of herself and girl-friends. Arjuna's remarks on declining her hand show that she was a mere child, although at least of marriageable age, *vayaḥsthā*, iv. 72. 4. She appears in full regal attire when ceremony demands it. Compare above, p. 114, and iv. 37. 29 for the doll, *pāñcālikā*. This seems implied in *sūtraprotā dārumayī yoṣā*, v. 39. 1, though a puppet, *puttikā*, may be meant. The first expression is used in the drama for the doll of a princess. Playing with a ball, *kanduka*, is shown to be a girl's amusement in iii. 111. 16; and *kanduka* appears again in Mālavikāg. iv. 17, *kandukam anudhāvantī*, as fitting play for a princess. The general name for childrens' playthings is *krīḍanaka*, which implies dolls, balls, carts, etc., or pet animals, as in the divinity's case, *vyālakrīḍanakāiḥ krīḍate*; Vāyu P. ii. 37. 281: compare ib. 36. 94. The usual amusements of the girls, however, singing, dancing, and music, are more corporal exercises parallel to the shooting and riding of the boys.

The reason for this is not less simple in itself than significant for the late and full development of many customs appearing in the Vedic age that we are wont to regard as peculiar to a later—or, in other words, for the lateness of parts of the Rig-Veda. For the only reason for the Rig-Veda's speaking of the forlorn condition of the brotherless girl must have been that which causes legal injunctions against marrying such a girl: namely, that the man who had only a daughter might claim that daughter's son as his own religious representative in offering oblations to the Manes of himself and ancestors. The right of the husband of the brotherless girl in his prospective son would thus be forgone. The dead father ought to receive the funeral cake, but that son could offer no cake to his father's soul; he must offer it to the soul of his maternal grandfather; and the main object of the father's marriage would be lost. Without a son, and without a cake, his soul would lie in hell.* The only interest felt for the girl was in the matter of her marriage. Before she becomes a wife, however, two points are to be settled. At what age does she marry, and at what price?

Now the later tabulated and scheduled wisdom, as we find it in the Bṛhat-Samhitā, gives a remarkable statement, to the effect that a woman is not full grown till she is twenty.† On the other hand, the only Epic that specifies the age of the heroine makes Sītā six years old at the time of marriage (quoted above, p. 110, note). But we can trust the law to help out the Epic in this particular. It is not likely that unanimity on such a point would exist among law-books, were there great differences in practice. Suppose we divide life into the four divisions usually accepted by the Hindus: babyhood, youth, maturity, old age. The period of babyhood extends to the time when it is necessary to put on clothes. Now some of the law-givers say 'let a girl be married before she wears clothes'; one says, 'before puberty';‡ and a later (verse) law says, 'while the girl is still naked let her father give her in marriage.'§

---

* Rig-Veda i. 124. 7: the girl without a brother runs loosely after men. G. xxviii. 20; M. iii. 11; ix. 136; Yāj. i. 53.

† *viṅçativarṣā nārī . . arhati mānonmānam (puruṣaḥ khalu pañcaviṅçatibhir abdāiḥ)*, B. S. 68. 107.

‡ *prāg vāsaḥpratipatter ity eke* after *pradānam prāg ṛtoḥ*, G. xviii. 23, 21.

§ Vās. xvii. 70: cf. B. iv. 1. 11–14 (Bühler). The length of the time the girl should wait to be given away, and at the expiration of which she may make her own choice, is set by some at three months: by some at

The pseudo-Epic chimes in with the rule that a man of thirty may wed a girl of ten (still clotheless); or a man of twenty, one of seven. In its informal part we find also the same advice, but expressed more indefinitely: 'a long abode in the house of relatives is not a good thing for women.'* The statement in the Epic 'they extol a wife whose maturity is past (*gatayāuvanā*)' points to the same view; for it is the married woman whose youthful folly has passed into middle age that renders the house and peace of the husband perfect (v. 35. 69). The law-book of Manu does not specify more nearly than to say that the girl may marry at eight, or before the age of puberty; but it adds a very special injunction that a girl is better unmarried forever than given to an unsuitable husband. The oldest commentator on this law objects to so early an age as eight, saying plainly that in such a case the girl is simply sold by her father. In India the marriageable age is usually reached between ten and twelve.

We have clearly in the legendary literature, both Epic and dramatic, a reversion to a freer age. Çakuntalā, Subhadrā, Mālavikā, Damayantī, Krishnā, are no babies of eight or ten. They are grown girls conscious of womanhood. The girls of the forests in their fathers' ascetic abodes, so often met with by kings and priests, are practically well-developed and full-grown.

Instances of legend and law might be multiplied without increasing our knowledge. We must, it seems, first of all admit that there was a difference of custom within the Aryân order itself; recognize that till the Vedic age is passed (back into the borders of which the Epic story extends), the girls were married after they had reached maturity, not before; acknowledge that the priests in literature prior to that of the Epic had laid down a maxim that girls ought to be married before this age, and that

---

three years. The latter seems to be the earlier form, for which later the 'periods' are substituted. Compare G. xviii. 20 (*trīn kumāryṛtūn*) with Vās. xvii. 67–68 (*trīṇi varṣāṇi*); and the confusion in çloka-writers, M. ix. 4, 90–92; Vishnu, xxiv. 40, and in the *ṛtu* substituted in the verse of Vasishtha (loc. cit. 70) after the prose *varṣāṇi*. Compare also B. iv. 1. 11–14). In the Epic, a month is the formal equivalent of a year (iii. 35. 32), and I have thought perhaps this *varṣa* is responsible for such informal confusion and formal substitution. 'The rains' might be interpreted as years or months (rainy season); *varṣe-varṣe* = each rain or each year. The 'four rains' means the months. It may be remarked in connection with the following discussion that 'in the bad age to come' girls will choose their own husbands and bear children at the age of five or six; boys becoming also mature at seven or eight: iii. 190. 36 and 40.

* xiii. 44. 14 (M. ix. 88–94). In the following Epic verses occurs the law-book rule that a girl 'after three years' unwedded may hunt up her husband herself (ib. 44. 16–17); the informal advice, i. 74. 12.

this generally received maxim expresses a general custom; see in the freer permission of Manu and the objection to child-marriage of his oldest commentator a later protest against such immature marriage; consider the Epic and dramatic legends as expressive of an ideal rather than a custom of the time; make a distinction between the lot of the higher and lower classes, the respectable and unworthy women; presume such a distinction made further by geographical difference in custom; and conclude that we have thus come as near to historical truth as we are able. The line of development in this matter seems steadily directed toward the state of affairs now obtaining, where child-marriages and child-widows are the general curse of the land.

Necessary and important is the evidence of the Greeks, with which I leave the subject. It proves that seven was regarded as an age fit for marriage. *’Εν δὲ τῇ χώρῃ ταύτῃ ἵνα ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ θυγάτηρ τοῦ Ἡρακλέος, τὰς μὲν γυναῖκας ἑπταέτεας ἐούσας ἐς ὥρην γάμου ἰέναι, τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεα τὰ πλεῖστα βιώσκεσθαι* (Arrian, Ind. 23, c. 9). *Μεγασθένης δέ φησιν τὰς ἐν Πανδαίᾳ* (?) *κατοικούσας γυναῖκας ἑξαετεῖς γινομένας τίκτειν* (Phlegon, Mirab.).

The period described by the Epic, and from which its story comes, represents probably an age in every way more happy for women than the later. But the time in which the Epic was composed out of old legends must already have known child-marriages. For this later custom we may give four reasons, if we put ourselves upon the Hindu plane of thought. First, the nature of woman: the objective end of woman's life is to marry and bear children; let her not, therefore, be kept from the labor the Creator intended should be hers, but undertake it as soon as possible.* Second, the pecuniary advantage: the girl was an expense at home, and was paid for when married; let her bring her price as soon as possible. Third, the fear of impurity: after the age of womanhood, contact with unclean women rendered men liable to impurity, and made it necessary for them to do penance; let her be put out of the way, safe and 'guarded': that is, where only her husband shall meet her (for 'women's apartments' can have been only in the large houses of the rich). Fourth, pride: it is an honor to parent and child to have the latter married well and early; and, as the Hindu says, a grown girl may commit indiscretions that ruin the happiness of three families; as women are utterly untrustworthy, they should be 'guarded' as soon as possible, even before they are of age; then the parent is free from danger, and the husband is certain that his wife is pure. Climatic conditions make these marriages of children possible: the practice reveals at once the state of society. Yet, with general condemnation, we must not forget the skilful, witty, and learned women of the earlier Brahmanic period, who are indeed often the best in coping with the priests in argument, and are put down by the violence as much as by the logic of their opponents. Like the women of that period appears Kríshnā in the Epic, a well-taught and clever disputant; nor are the others of her sex represented except in pedantic didactic as inferior to men. One might almost conjecture another reason, added to those above, and attribute the insistance of the priests upon child-marriages to a desire to suppress the intolerable freedom of tongue exercised by women in their discussions.

---

* This is the view bluntly expressed by the Hindus. Compare M. ix. 96, 'women are created in order to bear children.'

In the fifth century B. C., at the hands of the Buddhists, women became to a great extent emancipated. Then follows the era of enlightened women; the rise of the nunneries; the freedom from restraint—to be lost with the rise of Brahmanism again, though occasional glimpses show us in the period of our middle ages women that were esteemed as poets and even as lawyers: as witness the work on law by one Lakṣmīdevī, of whom Colebrooke speaks, and the women poets in the Saduktikarṇāmṛtam (composed 1205 A. D.?).*

Before taking up the question of the price paid for the girl, let us consider the kind of a girl one should marry. She should of course be 'of good family': the first rule, wherever we find rules on this subject, is always that a man should take care that his son marry a girl whose family is worthy of her; and his daughter, a man of like or higher caste. In this regard, because of caste, no land was ever stricter in its precepts. Legends, however, oppose the laws in showing us as many cases of men of knightly caste uniting with priests' daughters as men of priestly caste with girls of warrior-caste; and even the women of lower castes are here wedded to kings and priests. To be avoided in marriage are girls personally defective, or afflicted with disagreeable diseases, or with inauspicious names. Too close relations are forbidden to marry in the later law: 'one should avoid a girl of the same family as one's mother.'*

---

* See Notices, No. 1180; Cāndālavidyā, Bhāvadevī, Vyāsapādā, etc. are women among the 446 poets whose verses are here made into an anthology. There is no other language than that of men for the Epic heroines; but, as is well known, in the drama vulgar people and women generally speak Prākrit, or a patois, while the men of rank speak Sanskrit. Venerable women and even common women do sometimes, however, even here speak Sanskrit, e. g. in the case (Mṛcch., Act iv.) of Vasantasenā.

As among the earliest rules no such law is found, we may assume that blood-relationship was only gradually introduced as a bar; the early legends of the gods wedding their daughters and sisters seem to me, however, no proof of such custom in man.

Corporal characteristics are spoken of above.

The price paid for a woman is called *çulka*, a price or fee.† Gautama says that the debt does not involve the sons if unpaid by the father, and that the price goes first to the mother, or, if she is dead, to the brothers of the girl, according to some lawgivers; others say, to the brothers with the mother; but he leaves this point unsettled.‡ Tacitly, as well as peremptorily, the early law recognizes the sale of a daughter; later on (as well known, both stages are represented in Manu), the law forbids such a sale. In the Vedic times the sale of a daughter appears not to have been unusual (R.V. i. 109. 2). It is the rule to-day in some parts of India. The law-makers resisted the custom, and would have the fee looked upon as a gift. Nevertheless, it remained sales-money by the name of gift or fee, and was not uncommon, though the kind of marriage implying it is reckoned less worthy. The 'free-choice' of the woman must have been affected by it; for it is disputed whether it be legitimate for a father to give his daughter, although engaged to one man, to a better one, if the marriage has not taken place. The frequent denunciation of the custom proves its prevalence: 'he that sells his son or offers his daughter for a fee goes to hell.'* 'A gift for a girl is recorded by the good.'† 'They that dispose of a girl for a fee go an evil course.'‡ The 'fee' is sometimes a mere promise to pay.§ A permissible sale is veiled as a free gift, but open selling is condemned. Nevertheless we find the selling practiced.‖ Even the pseudo-Epic records a case of sale. Gādhi did not care to give his daughter to Ricīka, because he thought 'he's a poor beggar'; so he said 'first give me the fee, and you shall then have my daughter.' The suitor readily assented, and paid the price (xiii. 4. 10). Fee is sometimes implied without express statement. Compare 'this daughter was disposed of by the king, after the latter had stipulated the marriage-fee' (i. 193. 23). If a man, it is said, should give a girl to one man and then to another, he would be born a worm—implying payment.¶

---

* The injunctions are given in xiii. 104. 123 ff.; the *parivrajitā*, wandering (Buddhist?), is included among undesirable brides (also *ayoni* and *viyoni* connection blamed). In verse 130, *samārṣā mātuḥ svakulajā;* in ib. 44. 18, *asapiṇḍā mātur asagotrā pituḥ*. In ib. 15, 'one should avoid a girl that has no brother or father, for she is *putrikā 'dharmiṇī*.' See M. v. 60 (*sapindas* are those related to the seventh degree); iii. 5–11; G. iv. 2; Āp. ii. 5. 11. 15 (Bühler's note). The first quotation is freer than the second, and means simply, as translated, 'one should not marry a girl descended from one's father's ancestor, or one of the same family as the mother.' The legal restriction is 'within six degrees on the mother's side and not a gentilis or relation on the father's side:' in the Puranic law, the fifth on the mother's side, the seventh on the father's. The question is involved by somewhat contradictory tradition and by caste, into which the Epic takes us by its usual impartial giving of different views. Thus, *samārṣā* would appear to restrict the rule anyway to Brahmans. The views of the legal commentators will be found in Bühler's or Burnell's translation of Manu. The priest that in i. 13. 29 goes after a wife of the same name (*sanāmnī*), and refuses (14. 3) to accept Vāsuki's sister because she did not fulfil this condition, meant thereby not family but proper name, one with the same meaning as his. According to B. i. 2. 2. 3, own cousins may marry 'in the South.' For the usage given by the House-laws, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.* x. 76.

† This subject has been discussed by M. Léon Feer in *Journ. As.*, vol. viii., *Le Mariage par achat dans l'Inde āryenne:* mainly devoted to adjusting discrepancies between the marriage-forms in Ādip. and Manu (see below). Feer draws attention to the fact that the election is only a preliminary to the form of marriage selected (p. 476), and concludes that the *ārṣa* and *āsura* forms both imply sale.

‡ G. xxviii. 25–26. The first *çulka*-quotation from G. xii. 41, like M. viii. 159, is thus interpreted by the commentators.

---

* xiii. 45. 18 : compare M. iii. 54 with the following.

† i. 102. 12 ; see below, under marriage-forms.

‡ vii. 73. 42 (equal in sin to one courting a *rajasvalā*, or to an *āsyamāithunika*, or *ye divā māithune ratāḥ* (ib. 43). C. omits this.

§ In i. 103. 14, *vṛttaṁ çulkahetoḥ* is a mere promise on the part of the suitor.

‖ Compare in i. 221. 4, *pradānam api kanyāyāḥ paçuvat ko 'numanyate, vikrayaṁ cā 'py apatyasya kaḥ kuryāt puruṣo bhuvi.* The king of Madras says to a suitor who does not offer a price, 'you suit me exactly, but I cannot transgress our law; whether bad or good, I cannot transgress our family custom, and there is an impropriety in your request; you should not say: "sir, give me (without a price, this sister),"' i. 113. 9–13 ; ib. 10. The suitor paid the price; and he is the greatest saint in the Epic. Not content with paying, he says the rule is a good rule, a rule of God, a law enforced by the ancients, a law without sin; ib. 13.

¶ xiii. 111. 83 : compare also xiii. 44 : if one man gives a fee for a girl, another is promised the girl, another abducts her, another offers money, and another actually weds her—whose wife would she be? The answer is, that the Vedic ceremony makes the real marriage, and the promise is invalid in face of the fact that the girl is now wedded : followed, however, by condemnation of one that gives to one man after promise to another; so that the marriage is clandestine (28). In the following the fee-theory is stated in full : 'the fee does not decide the marriage: it is not the chief thing; a gift (to the bride) of ornaments does not imply that she is sold; eternal law proclaims that the husband should give something; it is of no consequence if one gives a verbal promise of a daughter; a girl should not be given to one she hates; a wife may not be sold; those that maintain that the fee given before or at marriage is really sales-money and the chief thing (and that the woman passes into her owner's hands solely on account of this) do not understand. For instance, if a man gives the fee for a girl and dies before marriage, the girl does not belong to his family; therefore the fee is not a price paid for chattel. The girl may marry some one else, or form a levirate marriage with the dead groom's brother (so Manu), or act like a widow (as usual, the Epic puts into the argument what destroys it; the statement that the girl in some cases weds the brother or acts like a widow shows

It remains to add of the marriage-money that Strabo attests the fact that a yoke of oxen was given by the suitor as a price for the girl (xv. p. 709). On the other hand, the wife's dowry is an unpledged sum given by the father to the daughter or son-in-law; in royal marriages the gift is often handsome. 'A befitting dowry' is sometimes spoken of; a king gives his new son-in-law a princely gift; Drupada gives gifts to all the knights when his daughter is married, horses, elephants, women (slaves), etc.; and Krishna carries the *haraṇam* of Subhadrā from her home to that of the Pāndus.* Compare the gift of King Virāṭa to his son-in-law when his daughter is married —seven thousand horses and two hundred elephants (iv. 72. 36). It made some difference whether the father gave to the bride or to the bridegroom, as the wife's property included 'gifts at marriage' (M. ix. 194).

The father of the bride at the election-day of his daughter has all the expense, not only in gifts to the pair, but also in largess to the people (though the suitor gives 'to the priests'). This advanced stage probably brought the fee into disrepute; the latter remained as a survival, and 'the pair of oxen' that the law enjoins upon the bridegroom to give is a mere formality. The bridegroom is really paid to take the girl, if the father can afford the honor of suitors willing to wed his daughter for her state. Probably, therefore, private and small families retained the fee, while at court and by the upper classes it gradually became looked upon as an archaic barbarism.†

---

she was regarded as sold to the dead man); an actual marriage is performed by taking seven steps about the fire or by pouring water; a man should wed in this way a girl that loves him and of proper descent (*anukulām, anuvaṅçām*), after she has been given to him by the brother; she is married by the ceremony (*upāgnikām*), not by the fee. Compare M. viii. 227 and ix. 71 (where it is questioned by the commentator whether the 'first' suitor spoken of is not dead); and Yāj. i. 65, who says that a girl promised to one may be given to another if the latter is 'better.' Our text (31–36, 45–46, 48–52, 55–56) is expanded in the next chapter (xiii. 45. 1–6): 'suppose the fee-giver has gone off without getting the price back; she is still sold to the fee-giver (*krītā çulkadasya*), and no one else may marry her; all her offspring will be his (if she marry another); but if married to a man of her own election (*svayaṁvṛta*), and with her father's consent. without a fee, some regard the offspring as not his; this is doubtful; let one do in this matter as the good do. This must be remembered, however, that a marriage is only real by virtue of a proper wedding; a mere cohabiting of a male and a female does not constitute a marriage between them' (*bhāryāpatyor hi sambandhaḥ, strīpuṁsoḥ svalpa eva tu*, 9). Throughout this passage, aside from contradictory admissions, the fee, though disparaged, is recognized as the custom of many.

* i. 221. 33 ff. and 44 (*jñātideyam* and *haraṇam*); i. 198. 15, Drupada's gifts. The king offers Vikramāditya a dowry with his daughter (Pañcadanḍaprab. 4 and 5), to take a late example.

† The rise of the royal election, with tournament and fête, results (Bhīshma. Arjuna, etc.) in the price paid for the girl being looked upon as

The question of selling a girl for marriage is illustrated by the old law of slavery involved in unsuccessful gambling. Although the formal law denies the right of selling human beings, women of the lower classes are frequently mentioned as slaves of war, serving in the capacity of servant maids or in more vulgar professions.* But this was not the only method of enslaving; for, as is seen in the course of the main story, the wife of an Aryan, and that a king, might be made a slave if staked at play. The scene is too well known to describe, and it is only necessary to refer to the fact that Krishnā is dragged into the gaming hall as a slave, and is addressed thus: 'thou wast a queen; thou hast been lost in play; thou art a slave' (ii. 67. 34); and she is then commanded to take off her rich attire, assume that of a menial, and go to the women's apartment and wash dishes. The husband objects to this on sentimental grounds, but, admitting the fairness of the game, he has nothing legally to bring forward against the enslaving of his wife. The only protest on the loser's part is that they ought not to bring a respectable woman into the gaming-hall where the men are. The one legal point raised is that described above, p. 123.

Slave-trade in women being mentioned and reprehended shows that the practice was not uncommon, though condemned: 'those that buy or sell slave women' are regarded as sinful; but this is a later law (xiii. 44. 47). As the passage following is in a section on war-rules, we must suppose that the girl intended is a war-captive; the passage shows an acknowledged right to carry off women as captives, but would restrict the authority of the captor in favor of the woman: 'a captive of war should be released at the end of a year; a girl carried off by a feat of valor should not be asked (to return) before the end of a year; the same rule holds for other property taken by force.'†

The attire of women is a subject not without a certain social value, but I regret to say that I have omitted to make special

---

so nominal that we find a *vīryaçulka*, or fee-of-bravery, regarded as the price: that is, he who won the girl by strength of arm paid for her by the feat. So the Ag. P. describes the bending of the bow at Sītā's marriage as the 'fee' (5. 11–12).

* Slave-girls are given away by the quantity, generally with their ornaments, as in viii. 38. 7, *asmāi . . dadyāṁ strīṇāṁ çatam alaṁkṛtam;* so xv. 14. 4.

† xii. 96. 5. If the girl wants to go, and says so at the end of a year, she must be returned; but she may not be asked till the expiration of the year. 'Other property,' according to the commentator, implies slaves captured by force. The general rule is that the girl or slave or any other property is returned at the end of the year. This must have been a rule that the victor followed or not as he pleased. I have already referred to the slave-girl given to the vicious priest in the 'northern country,' xii. 168. 29 ff. –173. 18.

note of this point, not having considered it of sufficient interest. I may mention, however, that in general there is distinction between the dress of maid, wife, and widow. The last wears no ornaments. The chief article of the married woman's dress is a necklace, this being indicative of wifehood. Other ornaments are worn in profusion by girls and married women. The rustic maidens seem to wear as little dress as possible, but queens and women of wealth are gaudily attired in linen or red and yellow silk (the men of the same class wearing red and blue silk). Thus Sītā and Draupadī are described: with the addition, that the hair is worn in a long braid, long enough to conceal a dagger in, according to the tragedy related in the Bṛhat Saṁhitā. The deshabille of a royal dame seems to be a linen cloth wound about the body; thus Krishnā, when dragged into the assembly, wears only such a cloth.*

Affecting both girl and wife is the institution of 'guarding' women, to which I have had occasionally to refer.

In the great Sabhā scene of our poem the heroine is dragged into the hall where the men sit after their gambling. In her deep distress she cries out 'I, I whom neither wind nor sun have ever before beheld at home, I now enter the assembly hall' (ii. 69. 5). And this indignity, even more than the forcible disrobing, seems to fire the indignation of the helpless heroes, who exclaim, 'they never of old have caused a righteous woman to enter the assembly-hall; the law of old, the law eternal, has hereby been put to naught.'† It was only in grief, and as a sign of mourning, that the veil was laid aside.

At a time much later than that of this scene, but still falling within the realm of the whole Epic, we find women who, while being Aryan, have yet dispensed with this good old rule. It is noticeable, however, that when the beggar-nuns mingle in public, they are not unexposed to suspicion of immorality. In the scene of the beggar woman who has come to visit a Solomon-like king, we find that the sovereign rebukes her sharply for her immodesty in so doing. She answers with a proof of her innocence: 'O king, I have come hither to learn (not to seek thee for a bad purpose); for behold! I have not touched thy hand nor thy limbs; I come into thy presence as the pure water-drop comes upon the leaf of the lotus. It stands and does not intrude within' (xii. 321. 168).

---

* Silk gowns are mentioned in xii. 296. 20. Krishnā is *adhonīvī* in the
assembly, ii. 67. 19. *Ekaveṇī*, 'with one braid': compare R. vi. 60. 7; v.
22. 8 (and 18. 21; 66. 13); also sign of a eunuch. The ornaments include
bells, as in *kāñcīnūpuranisvanāiḥ*, R. vi. 112. 13; v. 20. 16; 81. 29; from
the Epic I have only *nūpura* in xiii. 107. 30; iii. 146. 24. Sītā is dressed
*pītakāuçeyavāsinī*, R. v. 31. 2. Wedding clothes in drama are silk bod-
dice, red muslin skirt, necklace, shoes, wreath: Mālatīmādh. vi. 82.
The story of the B. S. 78. 1 begins *çastreṇa veṇīvinigūhitena* (with a dag-
ger hid in her braid the queen of Kāçī killed the king). The Amarāvati
tope, referred to above, p. 49, shows un-Aryan women barely dressed in
a belt, necklace, and anklets (of the fourth century). From the Epic
I have further noted only Subhadrā dressed as queen in red silk, i. 221.
19; Tilottamā (divine woman) *veṣaṁ sākṣiptam ādhāya raktenāi 'kena*
*vāsasā* (i. 212. 9), a Coian garb; and Krishnā, *kṣāumasaṁvītā kṛtakāu-*
*tukamaṅgalā* (i. 199. 3), linen clothes and the matron's necklace. The
'girls with one garment' abound in the stories of rustic adventure: but
it was a last shift for a woman of rank to appear in 'one piece of cloth'
(as in Krishnā's or Damayantī's case).

† ib. 9. The *pūrvo dharmaḥ sanātanaḥ* is the law of women's exclusiveness. Compare in the law Āp. ii. 6. 13. 7, etc.

It is said that the 'dependence' of women is a new thing. But there is no doubt that restrictions on the social freedom of women were early practiced, and I find nothing to warrant the assumption that anything of Vedic freedom in this regard survived except in the earliest traditional form of the Epic. 'Women should always be guarded,' and when Sūrya says to Kuntī (iii. 307. 15) that it is 'contrary to nature' that women should be *āvṛtāḥ* (secluded), he for a selfish end tells half the truth; but it was already second nature for women to be kept at home, girl and wife, all her life. Such a security against harm is the firmly enclosed court in the Nala story. A description elsewhere gives us the information that one enters through three different inner rooms of the palace, before coming to the garden, where there was a playground for the women, decked with flowers and fountains (xii. 326. 31 ff.). We know from Vedic times that the women had separate apartments, and the seclusion of the royal dames is a carrying out of this exclusion from the home of the man.* But how was it in the humble house? Here there must have been much intercourse.† The homely rules of the student show this, as well as the intercourse related in the Brāhmaṇas between honorable women and guests. But theoretically the woman was never an individual capable of taking care of herself. There is a much tempted St. Anthony in one of the later portions of the Epic who expresses to a young woman this trite truth with great force: 'an aphorism-maker says that women are all liars; that is the truth; it stands so in the Veda; do you say you are independent? There isn't any such thing as women's independence, because women are not independent; it is the opinion of the lord of creation that a woman isn't fit for independence.'‡

---

* Compare the princess in iii. 55. 21: 'closely watched is my dwelling; and my father the king is a man of severe rule.'

† The best way to guard woman is to keep her poorly dressed, according to v. 34. 40. Compare on older freedom of women i. 122. 4 ff.

‡ xiii. 19. 6 ff.; ib. 20. 13 ff.; 20, almost = Manu ix. 3 a, but v. l. in b. In xiii. 40. 8 ff., and xiii. 43 end, the injunction to guard women is expanded. Other remarks on the subject in xiii. 141. 26 ff., where the rule is given that 'a deposit (*nyāsa*) and a woman ought to be kept watch of.'

The evil of this dependence had one alleviation. For, being dependent, the women were not exposed to liability to err; and if they did err, the fault was in great part taken off their shoulders. If a woman goes astray, she is not blamed so much as her guardian. She is a prisoner; her desire to escape is natural. If abducted, she is still theoretically a virgin, although not really so.* It is only the Bhikṣukī (the begging nun, spoken of above) who is thought of as being independent by her own fault, (which makes) all her learning in revelation void (xii. 321. 64).

On great public occasions this seclusion of women was temporarily given up. During the marriage-election the maiden had to expose her face to the crowd; but besides this, on occasion of festival or sorrow the women form part of a very mixed procession, laying their veils aside in the latter case, as in the women's lament in the eleventh book; and even without this, being apparently flung together with crowds of men of all sorts. No statute permits this, but compare the story: 'crowds of women and crowds of knights went forth (from the city) mounted on carriages, accompanied by Brahmans, and the wives of the Brahmans (also were there) . . So there was also a great commingling of the crowds of Vaiçyas and Çūdras' (i. 126. 13 ff.).

In one respect the Hindu woman was bettered by the advance of civilization. She was, after the Vedic period, allowed no part in the religious exercises except when permitted in the simple Vedic rites. Knowledge of the Veda was also denied her. To speak in modern parlance, her religious education was entirely neglected. But after the completion of Tradition-works (as distinguished from Revelation-works, in which she had no share), she was not only permitted, but expected to hear and read them; and this went on under free Buddhistic influence, till even the highest philosophical truths and mysteries became familiar to her.

We read that women, like men, are purified by reading certain portions of a song in honor of Agni: 'if a woman or a man shall read this at both twilights (she and he are blessed)' (iii. 3. 77), although 'for a woman to peruse the Veda is a sign of confusion in the realm' (iii. 33. 82); and at the very end of the whole book from which this quotation is taken, we read 'if a woman or a man hears this story, (he or she) obtains all desires'; while in the latter portion she studies philosophy, and is deified for the knowledge of the attributes of Vishnu. 'One who knows self through self is freed from sin, even as a snake is freed from his skin; the man or woman who knows this truth is not subject to future births' (xii. 251. 10, 11, 23). But as to her right to use the Veda: 'the law has been fixed that women have nothing to do with religious ceremonies; for there is a revelation to this effect: women, devoid of manly power and devoid of law, are (the essence of) untruth (and therefore unfit for Veda and religious ceremonies).'*

---

* Vās. xvii. 73, *yathā kanyā tathāi 'va sā.*

The Wife.—It is of course recommended among the platitudes of the Epic that one should not marry a person of lower station, but should select one of the same caste.† What is meant is that a man should not marry above his order: the sociological key to this being found in the fact that a man does not rise to the social level of his wife, but the wife sinks to that of the husband. It is, therefore, better, if the marriage is not equal, that the husband should be of the higher caste. Kings wed the priests' daughters in legendary narrative, but are not recommended to do so. 'Thou canst have no connubial connection with me,' says a king to a woman of the priestly caste, 'for thou shouldst not make a caste-mixture.'‡ This rule holds always good, that a man may not marry a woman of higher caste; but the rule that a man may not marry a woman of lower caste is restrictive only of his first choice in wives. After he has married a woman of his own caste, he may marry others of lower extraction. A great distinction must be made in regard to what is comprehended under the word wife (*dārāḥ*).§ The first or priestly wife of a priest, for example, is the only real wife. No matter if a man has previously married others; when the woman of highest rank becomes wife, her rank reduces the others to a secondary position: 'she is the more venerable; she alone bathes and adorns her husband; she alone may clean his teeth and oil him; she alone may fling the offerings with him; she alone may give him food and drink' (xiii. 47. 32, 33). In the same way, a wife of the people-caste compared with one of the warrior-caste must slip into the background (ib. 40).

The four wives, three wives, two wives, one wife thus allowed respectively to priest, warrior, man of people-caste, and slave are by some restricted, through dislike to admitting that the slave-woman can be a wife of any but a slave. The slave-woman is a wife only through lust or irregularity; the third wife of a warrior would (according to the schedule) be a slave-woman, but she is not legally a wife. A man of the people-caste has one wife, the slave-woman would be a second, but she is not legally a wife. The slave has but one wife.'[*] Thus, if a priest really 'marries' four wives, the sons of only two are his own, 'like his self;' for not only the son of the slave-woman, but even that of the woman of people-caste (another indication of the nearness of these two), is 'degraded.'[†] The logical conclusion, reducing the son of the woman of people-caste when married to a man of the warrior-caste, is not carried out: 'a warrior's three wives bare him three sons, of which two are like his self; the third is degraded.' It is added that a man of the people-caste has two wives (*bhārye*), and a true son, 'like his self,' is born of each.[‡]

---

* xiii. 40. 11, 12. 'Devoid of law' (*çāstra*) is a later emendation on M. ix. 18, where women (in a verse just like this) are declared to be without *mantras* (or Vedic texts). Compare my note to Manu ix. 18. Compare the same in substance with xiii. 123. 5–6 (G. xviii. 1 ff.; Vās. v. 1, etc.).

† v. 33. 117: *sama* means like in all respects, but caste is especially intended.

‡ xii. 321. 59, *nā 'vayor ekayogo 'sti.*

§ xiii. 47. 30 ff. The rank of the sons here discussed lies outside the limits of this paper. See ib. xiii. 46–49. On illegitimate sons compare i. 120. 34; v. 140. 8.

These low-born wives were then really concubines, except in the people-caste. The fact that only the first married wife (when the others are taken in caste-order) may be wedded by the ceremonial points also to this. There is a plain contradiction, in both Epic and legal literature, in regard to the eligibility of a slave-woman as wife of a 'twice-born' man, which we may set against the legends that show us the sons of such offspring held in esteem, and we may conclude that the custom was not unusual, but with growing strictness of caste was censured, until such a 'wife' became virtually a mere concubine.[§]

To supersede a woman by marrying a second wife ('over-marrying,' as the Hindus call it) is allowed only when the first has failed in her duty, i. e. not borne a son, or been faithless, and the like. Divorce is allowed only in cases of especial provocation.[‖] We may hence conclude that a plurality of wives was admitted at first for kings, and afterwards extended to the ordinary subject. But the early priests appear to have had two or more equal wives. King and priest subsequently gave up polygamy, but resorted to concubines in addition to the bigamy and trigamy permitted. No verbal distinction makes this clear, however; the women are all 'wives.' The only women really forbidden the king by formal rule are prostitutes and priests' daughters (xii. 90. 29–39); and a Niṣādī woman is called a 'wife' even of a priest (i. 29. 3); as is also a slave-woman (ii. 21. 5). The restriction is but a rule not enforced, like that which makes a nymph *guror gurutarā* (iii. 46. 41). The heroes of the Epic have many women apiece, and each is paired with one real wife, so soon as Krishnā is exclusively taken by the king. But the possession of many 'wives' is allowed as a natural right of men, and the distinction in the meaning of 'wives' must be assumed to be late.* This passage sets polyandry against polygamy. 'Polygamy,' it is said, 'is not wrong; but it is a very great wrong in women to transgress against a former husband' by a later marriage.†

---

[*] Ib. 8, *na dṛṣṭā 'ntataḥ sm̐ṛtā* (*çūdrā*); 51, 56: compare M. ix. 157.

[†] xiii. 48. 4: 'in consequence of their sharing their mothers' family': compare ib. 15.

[‡] xiii. 48. 7, 8. A son of a man of the people-caste by a slave-woman is of the people-caste, says the commentator. Compare ib. 49. 7–8.

[§] 'A slave-woman may be a wife (of one of the upper castes) first to satisfy lust; but others deny this; a priest that has a son by a slave-woman must undergo penance,' xiii. 44. 11 ff. ('a priest has but three wives,' etc.). The commentator refers to M. iii. 13; Yāj. i. 56, as 'the other men'.

[‖] Jolly (loc. cit., p. 443), alluding to M, ix. 78, rightly says that the separation is rather a banishment than a divorce.

Polyandry seems to be an un-Āryan custom practiced by or assumed for the chief heroes of the Epic, who, five in number, are represented as marrying one wife, much against the girl's father's wish. The wife, however, soon becomes the special wife of the king, and subsequently the polyandrous side appears scarcely noticeable; although each brother is said to have had a son by her. It is a custom declared to be against all good usage, but some mythical legends are cited in support of it, and the legal objection is refuted by the common retort 'right is hard to distinguish;' but in adding, as the pleader does, 'I follow the custom of the ancients,' the advocate of polyandry goes too far, for it is as flatly said 'this custom never was practiced by the ancients.'‡

The authority of legends manufactured for proof is scarcely worth quoting; but it is noticeable that in one of the instances cited, as in the case of the Epic heroes themselves, it is not polyandry that is in question, but phratriogamy, to coin a word expressing the true relation. The one woman marries brothers; it is a family-marriage. The first case cited is that of Jatilā Gautamī: 'she is said in an old tale (*purāṇa*) to have had seven husbands.' The second is that of a dryad (*vārkṣī*) born of a saint, 'and she married ten brothers, the Pracetasas.'§

---

* The constant remarks on the jealousy of wives, the fact that the only ill a woman fears is *sāpatnakam*, may be noted, as e. g. in i. 233. 26 (in 31 the usual advice 'never trust a woman').

† i. 158. 36: compare i. 104. 35, where *eka eva patiḥ* is the rule 'from now on'; and Ait. Br. iii. 23, 47, 48, polygamy.

‡ Compare i. 196. 5, *katham ekā bahūnāṁ syād dharmapatnī na saṁkaraḥ;* and 6; also ib. 195. 27, *ekasya bahvyo vihitā mahiṣyaḥ . . nāi 'kasyā bahavaḥ puṁsaḥ çrūyante patayaḥ kvacit.* The next verse repeats that this is 'opposed to the world and the Veda.' See also ib. 195. 29, and 196. 8. But in i. 202. 8, *īpsitaç ca guṇaḥ strīṇām ekasyā bahubhartṛtā.*

§ i. 196. 13 ff. In vs. 23, polyandry is termed *bahūnām ekapatnitā.* The legend of Draupadī's repeated wish is found in i. 197, the last ten verses. Compare i. 104. 10, two brothers have one wife.

One of the law-books says that 'the wife is given to the family,' but adds 'this is now forbidden:' a statement, as it seems to me, indicating that polyandry was known but not allowed; and in the silence of other authorities we may assume it to have been un-Aryan.*

Zimmer thinks that polyandry is disproved for the Vedic age by the moral tone regarding adultery; this seems to me a weak proof; but the negative evidence furnished by the Veda is strong enough to make us refuse to believe that such a custom was in vogue. As to the morality of polyandry, that depends on the number of women on hand. If the people is still an invading host, the number of men is far in excess of that of the women, and the morality implied by a formal marriage of several men to one woman is greater than where the woman is common to several men without formality. Some of our western camps would be morally improved by a little strict polyandry.†

The form of marriage is distinct from the kind of marriage. The different methods or means of marriage are grouped by Epic and legal rule in certain divisions, but these are not marriage ceremonies. The latter scarcely differed much, and, as described in the House-rules, we may say that there was but one form—as we should say, but one wedding ceremony. The characteristic of this form was, as explained in the developed ritual, a three-fold circumambulation of the fire, with an added inner ceremony of seven formal steps; suitable verses and significant gestures (such as pouring grain) and movements (such as mounting a stone) taking place at the same time. The ceremonial is generally alluded to in the Epic simply as the 'rite of seven steps;' and the supposition is natural that the long ritual with its three circumambulations and the seven-step ceremony added is really but a later phase, in which a distinct ritual, at first differing from the 'seven steps,' has at last embraced the latter, which was originally enough in itself to constitute a wedding ceremony. Something of the same prevalence of another popular view remaining in the Epic long after the formal enunciation of the ritual remains in the ritual's directions how to elect a girl by getting her to select among certain clods of earth, and thus prognosticate her fitness for wifehood, over against the loose admonition of the Epic that she should have 'good marks.'*

---

* The use made of the rule in Āp. ii. 10. 27. 3, from which the above is taken, is for *niyoga;* the levirate law is declared inapplicable now, but was applicable of old, because *kulāya hi strī pradīyata itẏ upadiçanti,* the woman is given not to the husband alone, but to his family, and therefore, if he fail to beget offspring, his brother may form a connubial relation with her for this purpose. The tales above are of course cited only to indicate what seemed to the composers a fitting state of things.

† There can be no doubt that polyandry was frequently practiced in ancient times in India; the only question is, was it ever admitted among the Āryans? In some parts of India a plurality of husbands is more common than of wives—even as many as seven. Here, too, we find that the joint husbands are always brothers (Report of J. Davy on the Kandyan country in 1821). It is also a Tibetan custom.

Arbitrary rules and law are the following: not to marry a girl that does not love in return; not to marry if one's elder brother remains unmarried; not to marry a girl whose elder sister is unmarried; not to marry without the father's consent (against marriage by robbery)—these rules of law are all violated in practice.†

The ordinary kinds of marriage, the means by which the girl is acquired, do not seem to differ much from those generally practiced the world over. The lover asks the girl to marry him. Either she says she will and does so at once, or she is coy and says 'ask my father.' The father's consent is legally assumed as necessary even in the case of a goddess. In decency the girl must be given to the lover by her guardian.‡

It was this means by which the girl was acquired that made to the Hindu legislator the difference in kinds of marriages.

---

* The *Sūtra*-rules, with similar but not always identical ritual, are given Āçv. G. S. i. 7; Gobh. G. S. ii. 1; Āp. G. S. ii. 4, 5, etc. The first notes as a prefatory remark that the rituals are very different in detail; the incorporation of the 'seven steps' is shown, e. g. Āp. loc. cit. ii. 4. 17; Çāṅkh. G. S. i. 14. 5; Pār. G. S. i. 8. 1. The loose expression of the Epic is given in iii. 297. 23, *sāptapadam māitram;* xiii. 51. 35, id.; and often. As the ritual embodies a pan-Aryan rite (for circumambulation of fire, stepping upon a stone, and other details, are shared by other Aryan peoples), we may perhaps see in the seven-steps rite a foreign element incorporated later into the Aryan community. The steps are strictly not round the fire, but to the north. According to rule, the pair take hands only when of equal caste; as otherwise a woman of warrior-caste holds an arrow; of people-caste, a goad; of slave-caste, the hem of the groom's garment. In practice, however, in the case of a king wedding a priest's daughter, the expression 'takes her by the hand and lives with her' is indicative simply of an informal marriage: *jagrāha vidhivat pāṇāv uvāsa ca tayā saha* (*çakuntalayā*), i. 73. 20: cf. ib. 47. 5. A most interesting view of the pan-Aryan ritual has appeared of late (1888), *Die Hochzeitsbräuche der Esten*, etc., by Schroeder. For India especially, compare Haas (*Ind. Stud.* v. 321), who thinks the seven steps are first of general character to solemnize any pact, as of friendship between two men (so above), but regards this also as pan-Aryan. See above, on xiii. 44. 55.

† Compare xiii. 106. 22; and xii. 34. 27; 35. 27 ff., for fasting to secure the girl's love; and the rule of not marrying before the elder brother. The latter is a very venial sin, for after a time the pair live together, though at first the younger brother expiates his sin by a penalty. If the elder was fallen from grace, this bar was raised.

‡ Says a maiden in i. 63. 75: *viddhi māṁ kanyāṁ sadā pitṛvaçānugām;* says a nymph to her lover in i. 172. 24, *yācasva pitaram mama sa cet kāmayate dātuṁ tava māṁ bhaviṣyāmi te.* In iii. 224. 6, a goddess cannot be married without *varadānāt pituḥ.* So i. 81. 26.

Either the lover paid for the girl with the customary yoke of oxen, or he ran away with her, or he was elected by her, etc. Purchase, robbery, and formal election are the Epic means of marriage, until the late scenes already discussed, where, far from buying the girl, the suitor was rewarded by receiving a fortune with his wife. Of these kinds of marriage the most popular in the Epic is the knightly election. This custom does not appear to be regarded as peculiar or on the decline; it is not looked upon as an ancient rite passing away, but as modern custom. Indeed, all the paraphernalia, the brilliant court, the invited kings, the gifts to the suitors, the martial contest, show a period devoted to pageants, and not a relic of an antique usage. Choosing a lover was of course a maid's right from ancient times, but the technical self-choice or election of the Epic with all the knightly ceremony seems of recent growth. Besides the chief heroines, many others are incidentally referred to as having had an election; and the common expression used of a woman 'given in the election' shows its frequency. The girl, as said above, is either virtually given before the so-called election, or makes her election and is then given.[*]

The pseudo-election ceremony permits the girl to reject at the outset any unfavorable suitor.[†] In this pseudo-election there was no decision but that of the strength of the combatant. If, as in the case of Damayantī, she has a real election, the girl, after selecting from among the assembled suitors (whose names and ranks have previously been called aloud by the herald),[‡] advances and signifies her choice by grasping the hem of the successful suitor's robe, and laying a wreath on his shoulder. After this ceremony is over comes the wedding. The wedding-feast is very free, the bride pouring out liquor for the men and stimulating them to carouse. In some cases the defeated suitors remain and share the feast and the host's gifts.[§]

---

[*] Thus, in iii. 293. 33, a king says 'you choose a husband, and I will give him to you.' Compare i. 165. 7; iii. 12. 116: incidentally, i. 112. 3 (*pitrā svayaṁvare dattā duhitā*); i. 95. 76 (*kanyāṁ svayaṁvarāl lebhe*): vii. 172. 38, etc. The man 'elects' as well as the woman, and often the girl's choosing is represented as a last resort, because no man has chosen her.

[†] Thus Krishnā refuses Karṇa the right of trying to win her, i. 185. 11 ff.

[‡] *kīrtyamāneṣu nāmasu*, i. 102. 6; *nirdiçyamāneṣu vareṣu*, v. 120. 5. In the latest period, as in the election described by Bilhaṇa, the points of the suitors are given by an old woman who accompanies the girl into the hall (Bühler's Vikramāṅkadevacarita). Compare iii. 57. 27–40.

[§] From other tales. In i. 184. 11, a *divyo mahotsavaḥ*; in i. 198. 15–17, 'after the wedding,' gifts are given to the warriors. The seers and astrologers receive gifts at the same time. iv. 72. 28 (liquors drunk at a wedding). 'Wedding and carouse' go together if *āvāha* may bear the interpretation of 'invitation to carouse' given to it by the P.W. in xiii. 63. 33 (*āvāhāç ca vivāhāç ca*). Apropos of Prithā's remark that Draupadī is 'an alms' and must be divided by the brothers, compare the tale in i. 13. 29, where a priest begs for a wife as *bhikṣā*. Compare R. ii. 66. 38, *putrabhikṣāṁ dehi*. 'give a son as an alms.'

The poet intends us to believe that the election is meant only for the warrior-caste, but there takes place an episode which seems to show an equal participation by the priests. For, disguised as priests, the suitor and his brothers (in the case of Krishnā's election) enter the lists and fight. The appearance of armed priests does not provoke opposition until the contest is decided in their favor. Then the rule is made that priests shall never again be allowed to enter an election. We have here at first the same matter-of-course acceptance of warrior-priests as in the case of Kripa the son of the priest, who, being found as an infant by a soldier, *senācara*, was, on account of his nobility of appearance and his accompaniment of bow and arrow, at once supposed to be the 'son of a priest who knew the science of arms.'*

The other popular form of marriage is illustrated by Arjuna's stealing of Subhadrā. He simply runs away with her. Subsequently the wedding takes place in a regular manner. This method is not among those condemned, but it is not looked on with favor, except for the warrior. The six other methods are divided illogically, according as they are bad or for separate castes. Of these, the marriage by sale has already been discussed. The 'eight marriages allowed by law' are, according to the schedule, that of Brahmā, the godly, the sages', the creator's, the devils', the Gandharvas', the fiends', and the demons' (*brāhma*, *dāiva*, *ārṣa*, *prājāpatya*, *āsura*, *gāndharva*, *rākṣasa*, *pāiçāca*). The legality is, according to Manu (here quoted), in proportion to their priority on the list. A priest may be married by the first four; a warrior, by the first six; but kings may marry by the fiends' rite; the devils' rite is for men of the people and slaves. It is then said that three are legal and two are illegal, out of (the last) five of these; and the demons' rite and the devils' rite are absolutely forbidden; while the fiends' and the Gandharvas' rites are allowed a warrior (compare M. iii. 22). The first two fit only a priest, for the marriage 'of Brahmā' and 'the godly' are simply gifts to priests, the first as a free gift, the second as a fee for sacrificial work. These women did not necessarily become wives, for in the word marriage here we must understand in the broadest sense any means of connubial connection, and a marriage-rite is not meant. It was free to the priest to marry the girl so acquired or not, but the giving is not in itself a marriage. Six means of getting a woman are left. The first is the sages', the inherited method, and is described as the purchase of a girl by a pair or two of oxen (see above). The creator's way is described as the giving of a girl with formal verbal ceremonies. The next is the devils', where the girl is sold for as much as the suitor can pay (this is for slaves and the people-caste). The Gandharvas' method of union is free cohabitation without ceremony (the one recommended here). The two last are reprehended, and are only admitted because of the necessity of filling up the category with missing methods of sexual connection: the 'fiends' method being to steal and violate a girl; the demon's, to rape her when she is asleep or drunk. Another list, and Manu,* compared with this, show complete confusion; moreover, the fourth in the new Epic list is displaced by the election, put last. I have elsewhere pointed out the confusion in the 'legality' of these lists,† and Feer, in the essay alluded to above, p. 345, has tried by various substitutions to reconcile the discrepancies in the Epic. The same difficulty exists in the Manavic text, for here the *svayaṁvarā* (compare *patiṁvarā*) is recognized simply as the girl that elects her own husband (M. ix. 92), but the 'election' is not on the formal list. It is especially urged in other parts of the Epic that the 'fiends'' manner of securing a girl is proper for warriors.‡

---

* *dvija dhanurvedāntaga*, i. 130. 16 (compare 19. *gāutamo dhanurvedaparo 'bhavat*). It is, however, of course said that 'priests have no right in election; this is only for warriors,' and a Revelation is given to prove it, i. 189. 7 (*adhikāra*, here and xii. 297. 25). Compare ib. 11. (law of excluding priests). The quoted 'Revelations,' *çrutis*, in the Epic are often, as in the case of quoted Manu verses, merely lies strengthened by vague but grave authority.

Still another list gives us (xiii. 44. 3 ff.) the term *kṣātra*, or method peculiar to the warrior, as the one immediately after the one for the priests (*brāhma*), and it is described as where a bride is given according to the custom of the family, and is differentiated from the *rākṣasa*, with which in the Sūtras this name seems identical. The three lawful forms are here the *brāhma*, *kṣātra*, and *gāndharva*, and the two unlawful ones are *āsura* and *pāiçāca*=*rākṣasa*. It will at once occur to the reader that *prājāpatya* is identical with *svayaṁvara*, with which it interchanges in the lists above; and this is strengthened by the fact that in another passage from the same book as the last quotation we find *ārṣa*, *prājāpatya*, and *āsura* given as the three lawful forms (xiii. 19. 2), for the priestly, knightly, and mercantile castes, apparently. Of course *prājāpatya* is a late name, by analogy with *brāhma*, which in turn was misunderstood as 'Brahmā's rite,' though really 'for the priests,' as *kṣātra* is 'for the warrior.' The difference may, however, have been merely in the verses recited. In the Sūtras we find at first six marriages mentioned, of which the first three are in agreement with Manu; the fourth, fifth, and sixth are respectively the *gāndharva*, *kṣātra*, and *mānuṣa* (=*āsura*), according to Vasishtha. To sum up, we have two peculiar methods of acquiring a girl open to a priest. He must not steal or buy her, but may receive her as a free gift or as a fee. There is one method, called the sages' method, where a girl is sold for a yoke of cattle. This last is the only method known to the Greeks, but is reprehended, although acknowledged as an ancient custom, by the Hindu law-givers. There is one unceremonious connection, equivalent to a free-love union. There is one method called especially the warrior's, where a girl is stolen by force. The next method is to buy the girl for money.[*] There remains the forbidden rape and the ceremonious *prājāpatya*. As no real wife is made without a wedding, we may take this to be the simplest explanation of allowed household connection with women. Deducting the first two for priests, the third, preserved, although disliked, as an ancient rule, we have the connection recognized for concubines who had no wedding ceremony: one for the warriors, by force; one for the merchants, by wealth. Connection by free-love and by force might afterwards be ratified by a wedding, and the girl then becomes a wife. Thus (xiii. 44. 24 ff.), we find that a girl may be sold for connubial connection, and the man is not to blame if he has the wedding-rite performed. Had the Epic election been an old ceremony, we should doubtless find it in the earlier law-literature, nor find *svayaṁvarā* (kept till late) merely as a girl that chooses[†]—that is, not one given by her parents. In the second list of the Epic we find too that the election is used in a very free way, rather applicable to the man than to the woman: thus, *svayaṁ kanyā varayāmāsa* is used by the suitor.[‡] It is well-nigh impossible to suppose that the knightly election common in the Epic could have been a usual ceremony in earlier times, or we should see traces of it in the earlier literature; but here we find only that the girl chooses a husband; nothing of the great state and show of the Epic ceremony. It seems to me, therefore, that the identification of the Epic election as a later magnificent form of that method known to the law as one with a ceremony, and seemingly synonymous with it in our two earliest Epic lists, is well-nigh certain. Again, as the Epic election is common in the latest period, if assumed for a very early one it must have existed at the time when the Greek observers described India, and been continuously before the people. The Greeks know nothing of it, however; or are we to suppose that even historical sketches of the late kings (such as of Vikramāditya) would have described as historical elaborate election-scenes entirely unknown to that age?

---

* i. 73. 8 ff.; i. 102. 12 ff.; M. iii. 27 ff.

† In 'Manu in the Mahābhārata.'

‡ i. 219. 22, Krishna advises Arjuna to carry off his sister, although she was holding an election. In i. 102. 16, we read that warriors come to an election, but the knowing ones declare that 'the best way is to carry off the girl by force.' Yet the free love implied in the Gandharvas' method is also recommended as 'best for a warrior,' and that by a priest, i. 73. 27. As to the purchase given as a form for the under castes, it is urged, as shown above, that the purchase must be in the form of a gift—a *dāna*, not a *vikraya* (i. 102. 12); yet the *ārṣa* connection was originally for all what the *āsura* was later for the people-caste, a sale.

---

[*] Vās. i. 29 ff.

[†] Compare M. ix. 90–92; Ag. P. 226 (1 ff. on betrothal, and) 41, *adaṇḍyā strī bhaved rājñā varayantī patiṁ svayam.* Compare V. P. iii. 10. The election is the common form in all late legends, as in V. P. iv. 2. The girl is called self-given (*svayaṁdattā*) although she has nothing to say in the matter, as in the case of Arjunakā, Var. P. 8. 9.

[‡] i. 102. 11, 14; but in 3, *kanyāḥ . . çuçrāva sahitā vṛṇvānā vāi svayaṁ varaṃ.* Prithā 'elected' a husband because none 'elected' her.

On reviewing the Sūtra literature on the subject of wifehood, we find much the same confusion as in the Epic. Several wives are implied, without limit; again, a son born of a slave-woman is an outcast; a slave-woman is 'for pleasure, not for duty;' yet 'some' permit a slave-woman to be the wife of a priest.*

As to methods of obtaining a girl, only Gautama and Baudhāyana add the *prājāpatya* and *pāiçāca*; while Āpastamba and Vasishtha give the four usually given first (as above), with the fifth and sixth in Āpastamba, substituting *āsura* and *rākṣasa* for the *mānuṣa* and *kṣātra* of Vasishtha. These two, according to Baudhāyana, are a warrior's, and he goes on erroneously to claim *gāndharva* for the people-caste, whereas it is evident that the *gāndharva* is meant as a warrior-mode, and the *āsura* as one for the people. Sale is condemned. Āpastamba enjoining that 'the gift should be returned.' Āçvalāyana's House-rules are as late as Gautama's and Baudhāyana's laws in recognizing all eight processes of acquisition. Most of the House-rules ignore these formal distinctions.†

The *rākṣasa* or *kṣātra* seems to be the earliest method recognized for warriors: that is, simple robbery, traits of the original form being still recognizable in the completed ritual. Then came the *prājāpatya*, a civilized marriage for the same caste, alternating with the election, in Epic state and ceremonial. The *prājāpatya* form is exclusively for priests and warriors in the earlier texts, and in the later substitution of woman's *svayaṁvara* is probably practicable only to the latter.

Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, p. 30, would show that the *svayaṁvara* is mentioned in the Rig-Veda, and seeks to disprove my assertion, as stated in the abstract of this essay given in the Proceedings for October, 1886, that the *svayaṁvara* came from the *prājāpatya*. I was speaking then, as now, not of the simple choice of a husband by a girl, but of the Epic ceremony known as *svayaṁvara*; nor did I intend to take the trouble to prove that girls did not choose their husbands before the Epic era, but undertook to show the origin of the scenes such as are given on occasion of the marriage of Epic heroes—this being the technical *svayaṁvara*, the only one under discussion. I admit, however, that the abstract does not make clear that I was treating of this alone, though to prove that a simple choosing of a lover was known in early times would appear to be a work of supererogation. It is right to say that Feer's essay (quoted above) was the first to suggest the substitution of *prājāpatya* for *svayaṁvara*, although this essay was unknown to me when my paper was written. On the other hand, if Pischel means, as he seems to do, that the state *svayaṁvara* is proved by his citations from the Rig-Veda, I think he is wrong. He shows that Sūryā chose the Açvins as husbands, but not that this was a ceremony capable of comparison with the Epic *svayaṁvara*. In regard to the different kinds of marriage, it should be observed that the fiends', *rākṣasa*, implies a kind of exogamy; it is the theft of a girl from an outside family; while the perhaps equally old purchase (though it has been supposed by some, without much reason, that purchase is a recent rite) is the method of gaining a girl at home. Now between these stands what I call above a civilized form, the only form corresponding to a modern marriage on the whole legal list—that is, where the girl is neither raped, stolen, bought, nor given to a priest as a gift (slave) or fee, but where a lover, with the approbation of the father and with his blessing, is presented with the girl. This is the *prājāpatya*, so called, and the 'gift of the girl' here differs essentially from the honorary gift to a priest as a token of respect or as a fee. In the first two cases of priests' marriages, we have the girls' regards left out of account; she is a present, like any chattel, and the warrior is excluded from this 'rite.' But the *prājāpatya*, as Manu says, is legal for any caste; and he emphasizes this by giving several wrong opinions beside his own. Whether the *svayaṁvara* came from the *prājāpatya* or not, it is evident that the only method of going through with the necessary preliminaries of a wedding that corresponds in our legal list to the acquaintance and consent presupposed by the House-rules as having existed before the wedding ceremony is this method called *prājāpatya*; and, on the other hand, in our Epic election we have nothing but a peaceful exhibition, and consequent attainment of consent, preliminary also to wedding-rite. There is, excepting *prājāpatya*, no method on the list, which explains all possible means of acquisition, to tell us how a peaceful villager makes arrangements to get married; but this term designates the ordinary vulgar method of village-life, equally old with sale. This, transferred to a brilliant romantic court, becomes the election of the Epic, in which is no real strife or remnant of rob-marriage, as Pischel thinks, but a knightly entertainment, in which the fair lady selects her knight from the many that offer themselves; or they hold a tournament and she is the prize of the winner: a court ceremonial and chivalric state characterizing the whole exhibition. Thence it is that she is sometimes called *vīryaçulkā;* the price the lover pays is his bravery, as if a substitution of a feat of arms for a sale. In the rob-marriage of Bhīshma (as proxy), the *svayaṁvara* is used both of the man's electing and in this technical sense of the woman. When the word means simply that a girl elects one suitor at cost of others, it is doubtless as old as love; but when it means what it implies in the Epic descriptions, it indicates a state of society as far removed from a period when brides were won by robbery as the state of the Augustine age from the Sabine rape. It indicates further, with its dowry instead of bride-sale, a period when it was no longer a privilege to the suitor to grant him possession of the girl, but an honor to the girl's family, for which, although the knights contended for her hand, her royal father was willing to pay handsomely. Furthermore, the fact that the stories of the Epic speak of elections proves very little in regard to the antiquity of the custom, for the long stories like that of Damayantī bear no trace of great antiquity, the simplicity of the latter's style, honoring of the old gods, etc., showing high art rather than natural simplicity, wherein many incongruities indicate a later age than that pretended. Of these tales the gist is old, the form is late. The question of exogamy just raised does not seem to me to have been satisfactorily answered by Jolly in the essay quoted above. He regards the presence of the rape as a legitimate form of marriage on the legal list as proof that exogamy was regarded as a duty in older times (p. 430). I cannot assent to this. It was a custom, a privilege, but not a duty. There is no proof that exogamy was ever (as elsewhere) a required means of marriage.

---

* Compare e. g. G. xxviii. 16; B. i. 8. 16. 2 ff.; ii. 1. 2. 7: Vās. i. 24–26; xviii. 18.

† G. iv. 1 ff.; Āp. ii. 5. 11. 17; 6. 13. 12; Vās. i. 30 ff.; B. i. 11. 20. 1 ff.; 21. 2; Āçv. i. 6.

The chief duty of the husband toward the wife is to keep her pleased and amused, that she may be a cheerful 'lamp in the house;' for 'without a wife the house is empty,' or is 'like a dreary forest.' The estimation of the wife may be known by a few more such remarks, which may as well be grouped together: 'a man's highest good is a wife;' 'there is no medicine equal to a wife; no friend like a wife, no refuge like a wife;' 'one's self resides in the son, one's wife is a friend given by

God;' 'happy are those that have wives, the highest good;' 'reverend are women, sacred lamps in the house; wives are the joy of a house, and should therefore be guarded well.' I have given above some platitudes of misogynistic character, and pointed out that all the glory was for woman as wife, when on the other side equal extravagance reigns. But these citations must suffice for such a theme.* The wife was to the Hindu not only flesh of his flesh, but soul of his soul. In bearing a son she bore her husband, and is therefore called *dhātrī* and *janinī*, because she has incorporated and borne anew the husband's self, and has, therefore, become identical with it.† Matrimonial relations being freely discussed, as indicated above on *māithuna*, we find the general rule laid down that a husband must be regarded as guilty who does not please his wife in this regard. 'To leave a woman full of love is blamed;' 'the same as one that commits abortion is he that fails to have marital connection with a love-filled wife, when secretly besought.'‡

It is no woman-worship, however, but, if properly analyzed, man-worship, that prompts this honor to woman, i. e. to wife. For it is the incarnate husband that makes the wife glorious. And if we turn to the other side, we see this more plainly. The husband is the protector; he is the woman's god. Here and hereafter he is the woman's sole hope and possession. 'In the next world a woman's sole possession is her husband; he is her chief ornament; she has no divinity equal to a husband; he is her highest divinity; there is no refuge, no joy, no protector like a husband.'§ In accord with this, most of the laud of women is transferable to the husband: 'when the husband is pleased, the divinities are pleased,' etc. (xii. 145. 3). The song of the daughter of the king of Videha says: 'a woman has no sacrificial rite, no religious feast or fast; the wife obtains heaven solely by obedience to her husband.'*

---

* They are from v. 33. 88; xii. 144. 5 ff.; ib. 267. 31; 343. 18; iii. 61. 29–30; 313. 72; i. 74. 42–48; iv. 2. 17; v. 38. 11 (compare M. ix. 26, *striyaḥ çriyaḥ*).

† Another derivation from the same passage, xii. 267. 32 ff., is *ambā aṅgānāṁ vardhanāt*. In ib. 35 we find it stated that *mātā jānāti yad gotram mātā jānāti yasya saḥ, mātur bharaṇamātreṇa prītiḥ snehaḥ pituḥ prajāḥ*—as if the mother alone could tell the family and father. With Ait. Br. vii. 13 ff., on *jāyā*, compare 'the wife is *jāyā* because her husband is born (*jāyate*) in her; the wife's wifeship is in this, that the husband is born of her; the wife is half of the man, the root of his heaven,' iv. 21. 40 ff.; i. 74. 37 ff.

‡ i. 97. 5; 83. 34. This demand on a man is to be honored when made by any woman. In xiii. 143. 39 the 'village custom' is opposed to the rule *ṛtukāle patnīm upaçayet*. There are indications that on birth the man and not the woman was made impure. But by the common view both become impure: 'some say the woman becomes impure, others say the father' (B. i. 5. 11. 20–21); Vās. iv. 21; G. xiv. 15; M. v. 62. Compare in Greek antiquity Apoll. Argon. B. 1010 ff., describing the land 'where the women bear children and the men groan and tie up their heads; but the women care for them.'

§ i. 104. 30; 233. 26; iii. 68. 19; 234. 2; xii. 145. 4; 148. 7 ff.

Sumanā is instructed by Çāṇḍilī as to the conduct of good women: the wife should not wear ascetic garments of red or of bask, nor go with her head shorn; she must give pleasant words without harshness; she must carefully and continually cultivate divinities, manes, and priests; she must not act in a mischievous manner, nor stand in secret places, not talk too much; she must in all things seek to please her husband,' etc. Again we find 'the sum of a wife's duty is to be obedient and restrained; to eat what is left; attend to the fire, the household, and guests; her husband her refuge and her god; the wife must do as the husband bids, whether right or wrong; whether he be poor, sick, or on the side of the (public) enemy,' etc.†

Women have, however, the right of sharing a penance with their husbands when, as in i. 119. 41, the husband goes to the wood to do penance 'accompanied by the wife.' Disobedience is censured, but husband-murder is without expiation; punishment of the husband for lying is recommended by 'some,' but it is not said who inflicts it: probably said of the king.‡ The prohibition against witchcraft is meant in the same way as the rules above. Such power would relax the woman's dependence, and violate the rule shutting women out from the Vedic texts. As 'Vedic texts and roots' go together in these injunctions, we may perhaps imagine that woman's fondness for dealing with magical and harmful rites helped to exclude her altogether. The man that has a wife addicted to Vedic texts and roots, it is said, 'would be as afraid of her as of a snake that had got into the house.' This remark is made by Draupadī, who has just been asked why the Pāndus are so fond of her: 'is it vows and penance both, or texts or magic herbs, force of wit or force of roots, or sickness caused by muttering prayers?' Draupadī replies as above, adding that magic is to be applied against enemies alone, not as love-philters; a good wife avoids egotism, wrath; waits on her lord, etc. (much as above), and so wins his love; she does not joke and mock; she receives him gladly with a seat, water, and kind words when he returns from the field, etc.*

---

* xiii. 46. 12, followed again by Manu ix. 3 and 26. Compare 14 b = M. ix. 3 b; 15, like M. ix. 26.

† xiii. 123. 1 ff. (*kāṣāyavasanā valkaladhāriṇī*); xiii. 146. 46, 55 ff. Husband, wife. and children must, however, obey the parents and do the latter's bidding, whether right or wrong, iii. 214. 18 ff. In respect of eating with or after the husband, the Sūtras make a geographical distinction: Vās. xii. 31 (forbidden); B. i. 1. 2. 2 ff. (a southern custom). But when guests are present, the wife always eats after them, as Draupadī does in iii. 50. 10. Compare also i. 158. 22 ff., and ib. 3–4, 'wife, son, and daughter exist only for the man's sake,' etc. The Sūtras say that protected and pregnant women are, however, to eat first (G. v. 25; Āp. ii. 2. 4. 11–13: cf. M. iii. 114–116).

‡ ii. 64. 3. In respect of lying, 'some think a wife, a husband, a priest, and a pupil should be punished for that sin; but some (say) no (to this rule),' xiii. 44. 21–22. Compare xii. 121. 60: 'mother, father, brother, wife, and priest—these must not go unpunished by the king.'

Women are all guarded in the later Epic, but especially wives. To guard them is to guard one's self from jealousy; they are not to be trusted, even if good; 'even a mother of sons does not reflect on duty;' some, it is said, honor the father, some the mother; but wives should obey mother, father, and husband; 'I can find no other laws so hard as the terrible laws for women.'†

We find a general rule that women are not to be executed (e. g. iii. 206. 46, often repeated), yet the 'terrible law for women' enjoins to the latest period that an adulteress shall be slain in a much worse manner than that implied by simple *vadha* or execution. Death was inflicted as 'simple' or as 'variegated' in the Hindu code, and the latter, death by torture, was the one selected for false wives. They exposed her in a public place and had her devoured by dogs. But others prefer to have her mounted naked on a donkey and driven through the village. The Epic is freer than the Sūtras, which have in mind the regulation that women are not to be killed, and lay greater stress on the caste-order involved, and give optional punishments, such as the above of riding a donkey, or of sleeping for a year in a pit filled with cow-dung. The general Epic rule is that the seducer gets the greater penalty; the wife receives one-third the penalty imposed on one that slays a priest: a cattle-fine, or fasting with ascetic rules, being meant.‡

But without caste or *guru*-restrictions, we also find the rule that a guarded wife who has committed adultery should be eaten by dogs, while, as in the law-books, the man is tied upon an iron couch and roasted. In the case of adultery with the Guru's wife, the stress of punishment is the man's;

---

* iii. 233. 13 (*mantras* are for enemies, magic for them or for cattle-diseases: 'I know the bull whose urine smelling the barren cow bears calves,' iv. 10. 14, etc.). The *mūlapracāra* here inveighed against points to an extended practice; it is spoken of as the *samācāra* of bad women (loc. cit. 7 ff.). *Pativratātva* is the name given to the perfect fidelity of women whose husbands are gods to them, xii. 360. 10, etc.

† The first quotations in iii. 12. 68 (with the pun on *jāyā*) and i. 233. 31; xiii. 104. 138. The last in iii. 205. 5, 17, 8. In ib. 206 20–30, even a priestly guest is forsaken by a woman that she may attend to her husband, saying, 'please excuse me, seer, but my husband is my greatest divinity.'

‡ xii. 165. 42 ff. In ib. 53 twelve years' penance is allotted for priest-murder, but probably payment of cattle is meant here; *çeṣa*, 'the rest,' i. e. two-thirds of the fine, the seducer's penalty.

he is also roasted. He is subsequently reborn as a wolf; or, according to Manu, as a jackal.*

Death as the penalty is implied in the ordeal by fire in Sītā's case; the suspicion of adultery must be removed by entering fire, as a test of purity. In the real Epic story the wives are of so perfect a character that they do as they please, except in theory and aphorism. That social converse with men was quite open and natural has already been pointed out.

The Hesiodic and Manavic metaphor of a wife as a field, and the whole levirate doctrine hanging on this metaphor, is well known to the Epic. The wife is a 'pure field,' and 'on the husband's field shall he raise fair offspring.' A curse falls on sonless women, and the sonless husband goes to hell. Hence levirate marriages. We find also that adopted daughters are like own daughters in the matter of marriage: the second method of raising a fictitious son, illustrated by Arjuna at Manipura.†

---

* Caste order is not given in our text as a factor. Compare xii. 165. 63 ff. (M. xi. 177). Compare *khādayet* (M. viii. 371), *khādayet* (G. xxiii. 15), and *çvabhis tāṁ ardayet saṁsthāne bahuvistare* (loc. cit.) All the original harshness is preserved in Ag. P. 226. 42, *bhartāraṁ laṅghayed yā tāṁ çvabhiḥ saṁghātayet striyam;* and ib. 257. 65, the murderess is killed by drowning. For the other citations, compare xii. 165. 49 with the alternatives of M. xi. 104–105 following; also xiii. 141. 26 ff.; 104. 21. In xiii. 122. 9, we learn that *tapas* alone frees from this, old and new mixed together. In xii. 35. 20–25, the adulterer or 'robber of wives' does penance for a year. Compare also xiii. 23. 61 ff. (the *prayoktar*), and ib. 13. 3, 'murder, theft, and adultery,' the three sins of the body. All members of the Guru's family being venerable (i. 77. 7–8), it may be that an early distinction arose between simple adultery and that with the teacher's wife, especially as the youth lived with the teacher. But apparently the older general law was that an adulteress should be eaten by dogs and the man burned. The Sūtras add that the man should be castrated. Adultery with a low-caste woman, by the same authority, renders one liable only to a year's penance (G. xxiii. 32; Āp. i. 9. 27. 10–11). A distinction is also made, as in Manu, between women guarded and unguarded, but there is no Aryan limit here (G. xii. 2; Āp. ii. 10. 26. 20; M. viii. 374), except in the case of Aryan woman and slave (Āp. ii. 10. 27. 9). Outcasting is the penalty for adultery with female relatives and the Guru's wife in G. xxi. 1–8; Vās. i. 20, etc. The roasting, castrating, etc., are here limited to offense with the Guru's wife, though denied by some (G. xxiii. 8 ff., 'father only'); Vās. xx. 13; Āp. i. 9. 25. 1–2; i. 10. 28. 15–16 (Hārīta opposed). So killing by dogs is reserved here for the Aryan woman's adultery with a man of low caste (G. xxiii. 14–15; Vās. xxi. 1; M. viii. 371—2, caste implied).

† *kṣetram puṇyam*, i. 74. 52; *niyuktaḥ*, i. 105. 17 (the man, not the woman is here 'commissioned'); curse on barren women, xiii. 127. 13: cf. ib. 129. 1 ff. The sons of all sorts are given in the late passage xiii. 48, 49 (=M. ix. 160, x. 10, etc.); the daughter, in xiii. 49. 24: cf. ib. 12. It is said that commission is lawful at a woman's command, or with the Guru's wife. I may add the converse of this rule on the man, that the women, except at natural seasons, is for once *svatantrā*. But the levirate is forced upon her by her obedience (i. 122. 19–30). The law gives sixteen years from maturity as the time for appointing a widow (Vās. xvii. 59). The Epic legends are too well known to need detail: Pāndu's appointment of the gods; the case of Bhīshma, etc. The first form is

Woman's property. The simplest rule is given thus: 'three people have no property—a slave, a son, and a woman.'* From this to the statement in the pseudo-Epic that the amount of inheritance which a woman may claim is 'three thousand' is a long step. This later view holds in brief the following position: the daughter inherits in default of sons; the son of the daughter, *dāuhitra*, may also inherit; the woman takes the gifts given at marriage as her own property; the wife, with the above limitations, is the legal owner of what her husband may leave to her; the wife may make free use of what her husband has given to her; it is 'the fruit of enjoyment'; but she may not touch her husband's property; at the wife's death, her daughter of highest caste inherits what the mother has got from her father; the king may not confiscate the property of women left unprotected.†

As it is evident that these provisions for women's property are mere legal verses incorporated into the pseudo-Epic, we must revert to the 'no-property' rule as the law of the earlier poem. In point of fact, however, we have no property of women discussed in the tale except incidentally, as affected by the disposition of the wife lost as a stake in gambling, which scene alone shows that the woman herself and her nominal possessions were her lord's, to do with as he pleased.‡

Divorce was scarcely necessary, unless we extend the meaning of the word. If a woman sinned lightly, she could be 'overmarried'—that is, superseded; but her wedding connection was not annulled. It is formally stated that one should not separate from his wife.§

---

to appoint the brother of the dead man; then any one of the family; then during the man's life. Finally the priest is appointed. The priest is the substitute in the later rule, reminding us of Mandeslo's experience in finding that all girls were given to the priests on arriving at maturity, and none were fit for marriage till used by the priests: rather far from the Vedic ideal, *na çeṣo anyajātam* (R. V. vii. 4. 7). The Buddhistic law permits a man to marry his brother's widow, and also his living wife's sister; but to marry his dead wife's sister is unbecoming (Sparks, notes on the Buddhist law, i. 7).

* v. 33. 64; i. 82. 22; ii. 71. 1: all like M. viii. 416.

† Compare xiii. 45. 10 ff. = M. ix. 130 ff.; ib. 46. 2 = M. iii. 54; ib. 47. 23-25: cf. M. ix. 198–200 (Manu's *nirhāra* is here *apahāra; nā 'pahāraṁ striyaḥ kuryuḥ*); in 23, *trisahasraparo dāyaḥ striyāi deyo dhanasya vāi, bhartrā tac ca dhanaṁ dattaṁ yathārhaṁ bhoktum arhati.* Last quotation in xiii. 61. 25. For pensioned widows, see above, p. 61.

‡ Into the legal points of *strīdhana* I cannot here enter, but may refer to the essay of Jolly already quoted for the legal view, and to the Puranic rule giving six kinds of property to women. Ag. P. 255. 30; 209. 22, 27. In this work, 221. 20 ff.—23 and 223–226 treat especially of women, generally from the same point of view as the law-books, but here any woman without distinction attains heaven by entering 'her husband's fire.'

§ xii. 270. 27, *na patnīṁ vihareta nārīm.* The commentator (see M. ix. 46, 80–81, 83) compares Āp. ii. 5. 11. 12–14 (Vās. xiii. 49; xxi. 9–10), saying that *vibhajeta* is meant.

On the treatment of the wife, two tales may show the practical teaching. The second is absurd, but worth reading.

'There came a guest to a poor man's cottage; he was very hungry. They gave him food, and he ate it all and was hungry. Then the householder, knowing the guest-law, gave the stranger his own share. But he ate it and was hungry. Then the wife would give her share also; but the householder broke the guest-law, saying: 'nay; thou art wearied and hungry; eat, wife, for the beasts and insects protect their wives; thou also shalt not suffer' (xiv. 90. 38 ff.). 'Jamadagni was a priest who used to amuse himself by shooting arrows; his wife ran after them and picked them up. Once she remained a long time. When she returned, he demanded why she had been so long collecting the arrows. She answered: the sun was very hot; my head burned, my feet were tired. Then he said, did the sun dare? I will shoot the sun. Therefore he shot at the sun, but could not hit it, on account of its speed. But he knew that at noon the sun stands still one half a wink; and he said, in that wink I shall hit it. But the sun became frightened, and said, do not shoot me, I am useful to thee; I bring the clouds and rain and fruit. Then Jamadagni decided not to shoot. But he said, show me how I may protect my wife when she runs about collecting arrows. The sun said, make a shade and hold it up; make leather covers and put them on her feet. Thus Jamadagni invented umbrellas and sandals, and his wife ran after his arrows without harm' (xiii. 95. 2 ff.).

Another tale makes the world, depopulated by warriors, grow again by virtue of marriages between priests and women of the warrior-caste. The period was one of great felicity, as the inhabitants in this second creation were devoid of lust, and even the animals were virtuous, opposed to the unbridled sin of the earlier era. The story may be nothing but a moral on the good influence of priests.*

The Mother.—Little as we see of women in this light, we cannot but admire the attitude held by the heroes toward Prithā, or in fact any scene where the mother occurs.† She is holy, as the father is; the children must obey her as they obey him. She is to be guarded by her son, and protected by him when her husband is dead. ‘More elevated than heaven is the father; more venerable than earth, the mother.’ She is again said to be the most venerable of all persons.*

---

* i. 64. 5 ff. The story is often repeated. Compare i. 104. 5; 122. 3 ff.; xii. 228. 50 ff. In xii. 207. 40, the Kali age first sees marriage. The later condition of wifehood in the period of child-marriage is well illustrated by the tale of Dharmavyādha, whose daughter is given away to a young man, and is obedient to him and to his sister, till the latter says something disagreeable about her father, on which she runs home crying to her papa: Var. P. 8. The same Purāṇa uses *vivāhasāmagrīṁ kṛtvā* as 'preparing for the wedding,' Var. P. 22. 44.

† Prithā, Gāndhārī, and the other mothers of the Epic are looked upon with the greatest veneration. A passing touch shows this on the wedding-night of the Pāndus. We find the new-made bride sleeping at the feet of the heroes; their mother, before them (*purastāt*), at their head, i. 192. 9.

Whether father or mother deserve more respect is the only question allowed on this point. Women as mothers are identified with the earth, as man is with the creator. So it is said in one place that the mother surpasses the father; in another, that the father is better than the mother.† The eldest sister is regarded as a mother, and so too the brother's wife, if one has been nursed by her. This corresponds to the fatherly position occupied by the eldest brother.‡ The mother's curse is, it is said, one for which there is no antidote, although all other curses may be averted (i. 37. 4).§

The Widow.—As seen above, the son protects his widowed mother. Among these with whom one should not engage in business are sons, brothers, a widow, and a son-in-law (v. 37. 30). The self-immolation of Mādrī, although she is described as ‘resolved on heaven’ (i. 126. 30), is merely that of a favorite queen. Nothing would indicate that a common woman, or a woman of priestly caste, ought to die on her husband's pyre.‖ I showed above that this custom probably originated with royalty, and was in the beginning confined to one wife.¶ The emphasis with which the ideal time of old is referred to as one ‘when there were no widows’ (i. 109. 11) would imply an undue number at the time of the writer. So, too, the remark that ‘all men run after a widow’ shows the widows as a frequent and disturbing element in society.**

---

* iii. 293. 35; v. 33. 74; i. 105. 32; xii. 65. 17; iii. 313. 60 (*mātā gurutarā*); i. 196. 16; xii. 108. 3 ff.; xiii. 104. 145. In the two last, the mother's will is law, although it be wrong or hard. Compare Tāitt. Up. i. 11, ‘thy mother shall be to thee as a god.’ Compare also G. ii. 51; Vās. xiii. 48; Āp. i. 10. 28. 9, etc.

† xii. 108. 17, 24, and xiii. 105. 15 (= M. ii. 145); compare ib. 106. 65; xii. 190. 15; 108. 25; 297. 2. The mother and father are each ‘lord of their children’ by i. 105. 32.

‡ xiii. 105. 19–20 (*jyeṣṭhā mātṛsamā bhaginī*); sisters without children live in their brothers' house, v. 33. 70.

§ Edward Thomas, in his essay “On the Position of Women in the East in Olden Time,” not imparting much of value for India, would prove a metronymic custom of naming children. As shown above, p. 49, this is only partially true.

‖ In the drama, the suttee of a Brahman woman is expressly said to be a sin (Mṛcch., Act x). In the ordinary burial of xii. 298. 38, the Epic knows nothing of this practice; the support of widows is implied ib. 228. 49.

¶ Jolly thinks the practice began with ‘the lower castes,’ but adds as a suggestion ‘the warrior-caste’ (loc. cit., p. 448).

** ‘All men run after a woman who has lost her husband, as birds run after food let fall on the ground,’ i. 158. 12. It is added that she should die before or with her husband.

In harmony with its general character, the Epic both knows and ignores Suttee.[*] We must undoubtedly make geographical distinctions, as well as those of time. Burnell says that the custom is more common in the Gujarati records than in the south, where they are 'only to be found in the Telegu-Canarese country.' He says 'the custom has never been common in southern India' (Palæog., p. 78, 120).[†]

In Epic law, a second husband is forbidden, whether the first husband be dead or alive.[‡] The Epic story ignores such a rule. Damayantī as a grass-widow finally seeks refuge in a neighboring kingdom, and serves the queen's daughter, on condition that she shall not have to eat leavings or wash feet or speak to men; if a man desire to marry her, he shall be fined and then slain. In the same way Krishnā, in the late fourth book, becomes the companion of the wife of Virāta on exactly the same conditions, as a *sāirindhrī* or maid.[§]

Except in the case of a *satī*, women refrain from suicide, although they generally threaten to kill themselves when disappointed. They mention, as means of executing their threats, hanging, fire, water, and poison—but they always continue to live.[‖]

Queens are as independent rulers comparable with slaves in like capacity; alluded to, but disparagingly, as rulers very undesirable: 'when a woman is the ruler, men sink like stone-boats' (above, p. 136, note). Women's kingdoms seem far off and foreign, and are grouped as such: ‘the barbarians, the Yavanas, the Chinese, and those that live in a woman's kingdom’ (iii. 51. 25).

---

[*] See above, p. 116 ff., and i. 74. 46, *mṛtam bhartāraṁ sādhvy anugacchati*, the general rule.

[†] I might add in connection with this suicide of the woman that the Çiva faith demands the same of the man in the Puranic period: *agnim praviçate yas tu rudralokaṁ sa gacchati*, Vāyu P. i. 21. 66. So Kalanos? The Epic condemns the *ātmahā pumān*, male suicide, i. 179. 20; so also the law, Āp. i. 10. 28. 17; Vās. xxiii. 14 ff.; G. xiv. 12; M. v. 89; so Puranic law in general, Ag. P. 157. 32; drama, Utt. R., Act iv.; Mṛcch., Act i.

[‡] i. 104. 34–37. The law 'from now on' is thus given by Dīrghatamas. with the addition that the woman's property, however rich she may be, would only cause her to become *vṛthābhogā*, or an unlawful enjoyer (commentator as *puṁyoga*). A second husband is recognized in law, e. g. Vās. xvii. 19, 20; M. ix. 175, but with disapproval. Even the virtuous Damayantī pretends to marry again, implying the usage.

[§] iii. 65. 68; iv. 9. 32–36. A set term is appointed by the law-books for a grass-widow to wait for her husband's return, three, six, twelve, etc. years being specified: G. xviii. 15 ff.; M. ix. 76; Vās. xvii. 75 ff. (five years). In Prithā's position we have a glimpse of the extraordinary morality allowed in a woman, provided she be a childless wife. Compare the definition in i. 123. 77, *nā 'taç caturtham prasavam āpatsv api vadanty uta, ataḥ paraṁ svāiriṇī syād bandhakī pañcame bhavet*. The line seems drawn at four legitimate children got by other than the husband: after that the woman is reprehensible. This is given as a proverb, and not only in application to Prithā.

[‖] Compare Damayantī and Uttarā in iii. 56. 4; xiv. 69. 9. The men are as extravagant: compare iii. 7. 6, with 'the sword' added in a like vain threat.

Women-warriors are as unfamiliar as independent queens. Only Drupada's boy-girl upholds a legend which, if it means anything, means that a child was, though a female, brought up as a boy, and became a warrior. The figure of this warrior seems too intimately connected with many scenes to allow us to suppose that it was invented as an excuse for Arjuna. The child ‘was born a girl and became a boy,’ for its parents proclaimed it as a son.

---

* vi. 119. 34, *strībhāvāc ca çikhaṇḍinaḥ*; vi. 107. 81, *yathā 'bhavac ca strī pūrvam paçcāt puṁstvaṁ samāgataḥ* (compare ib. 106).

# ADDITIONS

p. 47, note, on, *āhvāyaka*, as judge, xii. 76. 6, compare Muir, Ind. Ant. iii. 238.

p. 52, first line of note, compare Bühler on G. x. 17, 18.

p. 65, note *, add *pītvā kāilātakaṁ madhu* in vii. 112. 62.

p. 67, note †, compare Āp. G. S. vii. 18. 1.

p. 182, on position of knight, add vii. 156. 120, *rathamadhyasthaḥ*.

p. 184, on *varūtha*, against commentator as quoted, note *ayasmayo varūthaḥ* in vii. 43. 5, and compare the iron car of a demon, ib. 167. 39.

p. 187, on *dhvaja*, note *indrakīla* (in C., *indrajāla*), part of staff, in vi. 59. 122; compare note on p. 242.

p. 201, on horses, note Krishnā, beautiful 'as a mare of Kashmere,' in iv. 9. 11, *kāçmīrī 'va turaṁgamī*.

p. 210, on tusks of elephants, add *caturdanta iva dvipaḥ*, vii. 16. 19.

p. 215, note ‡, on bow-string, add i. 225. 21.

p. 246 fourth line; in R. the *gantra* are raised; in Mbh., the *çataghni*.

p. 308 on phratriogamy: in i. 104. 10, the wife of one brother objects to union with the second only because she is enciente.

# CORRECTIONS.

p. 20, abbreviations, for *A. P.* read always *Ag. P.*

p. 21, lines 7 and 8 from foot, transpose the lines.

p. 23, note, line 15, after *below* read *p. 134.*

p. 24, last line of note, for *Pār. G. S.* read *Parāç. Smṛti.*

p. 40, note, line 6, for *explained* read *unexplained:* lines 8, 20, 30, for pp. *76, 72, 80* read respectively pp. *78, 74, 82.*

p. 41, line 27, for *kind* read *hind.*

p. 43, note *, the quotation is from R. vi. 51. 58.

p. 57, note †, line 4, for p. *77* read p. *79.*

p. 60, note ‖, line 12, dele *41.20.*

p. 65, note ‡, line 1, for *iii. 15. 13* read *iii. 15. 14.*

p. 67, note †, line 2: Āpastamba means here the verse of Āp. as interpreted by the commentator (see p. 66, note ‡, line 3); for *recognition of state gambling-tables* should have been written *recognition of royal revenue from state gambling-tables.*

p. 70, line 21, for *legal* read *early.*

p. 71, note †, line 12, for p. *45* read p. *83.*

p. 73, line 2, for *once* read *own.*

p. 76, note §, line 4, for pp. *77, 87* read *79, 88;* ib., line 9, for *thirtieth* read *thirteenth.*

p. 81, note ‡, line 2, for *G. S.* read *Smṛti.*

p. 100, line 2, for *and falsely* read *then falsely.*

p. 121, note †, line 15, for *above* read *about.*

p. 143, note, line 2 from top, for *viii.* (160. 43) read *vii.*

p. 152, note, read *āsādya ; vīmam* . . . .

p. 171 note *, for *241* read *Ag. P. 241.*

p. 182, note *, line 6, for *the yugaṁdhara* read *Yugaṁdhara.*

p. 184, note ¶, dele *and vii. 16. 31.*

p. 246, line 4, for *over* read *at* (see additions).

# INDEX

The chief topics will be found in the table of contents. The index contains the minor subjects and such further elucidatory references to the primary topics as are not indicated by the table of contents. The numbers signify pages.

Abortion, 281.
Adultery, 51 , 62, 310ff.
Age, of manhood, 54, 81, 113, of womanhood, 285 ff.
Ages, 58.
Agriculture, 47.
Ambassador, 95 (106 ff.)
Aristocracy, 47 , 79.
Army, 38, 129, 190, 140 ff., 145, 165.
*ātatāyin*, 131, 175.
*açani*, 241.
Assembly, see council.
Autonomy of towns, 80i.
Beef, eaten, 64.
Battle, appearance of, 169, 266; laws of, 161.
Boasting, 177, 261.
Brihaspati, 63, 751, 109, 126, 146 ff., 151, 163, 170.
Burial, 115, 314.
Capital punishment (see adultery, drinking, thieves), 78, 280.
Castes, 17 ff., 24, 31, 36, 50, 112, 282.
Cattle, 24 ; branding of, 110.
Cavalry, 168 (206 ff.).
Charioteer, 39 (151 ff.).
Chastity, 62, 278 ff., 281.
Children, 283, 284.
Circuit of state, 75 : circles of battle, 187, 228, 230.
Commander-in-chief, 44, 143, 148 ; a kingly office, 159, 164, 166.
Commandments, eight or ten, 60.
Consecration (see *nīrājanā*), 89.
Corporations, 25 ff., 40, 128.
Council, 43 ff., 46, 76, 92, 94 ff., 104.
Court of law, 76 ff.
Courtiers, 43, 93.
Crimes (see abortion, adultery, murder, thieves, vices), inexpiable, 28, 281.
Dancing, 62, 65, 121, 270, 273, 278.
Deserter, slain, 133.
Dialects, 26.
Drama, 56, 69, 121, 273, 278, 288.
Dress, 49, 114, 250, 261, 285, 292 ff., 309, 313.
Drinking, 65, 121.
Election, of king, 87 ; of husband or wife, 111 ff., 303 ff.
Family, origin of, 79 ; rule of, 83) ; wife of, 298 ; order in battle, 137.
Farmers and traders, 18, 20, 24 ff., 36, 38, 40, 41.
Fate, 131, 260.
Father (see Guru), 185, 374.
Fighting, as a law, 131.
Foreigners (see Kurus), 40, 42, 191, 283; Yavanas, 19, 80, 156, 239, 249.
Gamblers, 65 ff., 83.
Games, 69, 284.
Gāthās, 69, 271.
Genealogies, 13, 273.
Gods, 259, 260.
Guards of army, 144, 149, 165, 196, 205.
Gun-powder, 243 ff.
Gurus, 81, 86, 97 ff., 199, 105, 314; wifes of, 281.
Hair, 137, 251, 276.
Hereditary succession, 81, 127.
Horses (see cavalry and sacrifice), color of, 35, 189, 201 ; 199 ff.
Hunting, 63.
*ītayaḥ*, 27.
Judges, 46, 72, 76.
King, 26, 39, 80 ; titles of, 23, 157 ; origin of, 43 ff., 57 ff.; deified, 58, 197 ; daily life of, 73.
Kurus of the North, 19, 40.
Lamps in battle, 148.
Land-ownership, 31 ff.

Levirate, 290, 299, 311, 315.
Literature, 52, 55, 56.
Lords of realm, 43.
Love, 278; love-charm, 310
Lying, 68, 309.
Magic (252 ff.), 256, 309 ff.
Mahābhārata, origin of, 2 ff., 268; fifth Veda, 56.
Marriage, 54), 111 ff., 285 ff., 299 ff.; price, 289 ff.
Means, the four, etc., 70, 126.
Megasthenes, 3, 32, 42, 68, 80, 115, 118, 134, 287, 291.
Mercy. 30, 173'.
Military authorities, 146.
Moral, laws, 48, 59 ff., 67 ff., 175; responsibility, 76.
Mother, 313; brother of, 85.
Mourning, 132.
Mules in war, 203.
Murder (see *ātatāyin*), 57, 280, 309.
Music, 114, 143, 262 ff.
Names, 49, 110, 308.
*nīrājanā*, 92, 120, 121.
Officers (see council), of king, 28 ff., 39, 45, 72; of war, 147, 165.
Ordeals. 77.
Outcasts, 281.
Poison, 551, 122, 221.
Polyandry, polygamy, 114, 298.
People-caste, 17 ff., 23, 38.
Priests, 16, 32, 23 ff., 36, 40, 47, 94) ff., 98, 102, 116, 128 ff., 142, 192, 269, 272, 297.
Prognostications, 258.
Queens, 80, 305.
*rathanīḍa*, 282.
Realm, divided, 21, 27, 171.
*sabhā*, 92.
Sacrifice, horse, 90; human, 823.
Çūlihotra, 146.
Salutation, 19, 50, 281
Çankhalikhita rule, 99.
*çataghni*, 242, 244.
Sex, cause of, 279.
Slaves, 17, 41, 343, 298; of war, 51, 281; as kings, 80.
Sons, 68, 82.
Spies, 96, 128, 142, 144, 198 ff.
Suicide, 315.
*çūra*, 43 ff., 166; 247.
Suttee, 116 ff., 315.
*svayaṁvara*, see election.
Taçitus, 44), 157, 67, 135, 267
Taxes, 30 ff., 33, 34, 35.
Teacher, see Guru.
Thieves, 23, 78, 80.
Towns, 21, 40, 80, 118 ff.
Tribute, 35.
*triveṇu*, 186.
Uçanas, 73, 75, 137, 146 254.
*utsedha*, 339.
Vasishtha, 17, 19, 96, 103, (123).
Vedas, 55, 56, 132, 309; Atharva, 256 ff., 262; *dhaṇurveda*, 55, 252.
Vengeance, 127.
Vices (see drinking, gambling, hunting, lying, crimes, women), 61, 283.
Victory, 59, 203, 261.
*vinaya*, 103.
Villages (see towns), anunals of, 63; as gifts, 116; custom of, 308
Vows, 177.
Vṛṣala, 112.
*vyūha*, 136, 139 ff., 145; door of, 169.
Warriors (see priests, slaves, women), nobles, and common, 36, 42, 48, ff., 98, 313; derivation of name, 58, 130; study of, 52 ff.
Weapons, 120, 122; divine, 236, 240 ff., 257.
Witnesses, 76', 282.
Woman (see abortion, adultery, chastity, dancing, dress, drinking, family, games, Guru, marriage, names, polygamy, queens), purity, 275, 281 ff.; ideal, 276 independence of, 294; obedience, 279, 322; honor to, 308; conduct, 309; guarded, 283, 293 ff., 310; property of, 312, 315; divorce, 297, 312; eating with, 309; as a warrior, 316; as a vice, 62; poets, 288; religion of, 296; second wife, 297; second husband, 315; wife's relations, 43; widows, 51, 116, 343, 314.
*yantra*, 122, 245.
Year, as month, 286.